



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CHAUCER'S LOLLIUS

BY GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE

CHAUCER'S LOLLIUS has long been regarded by us critics and scholars as a mystery; and, to confess the truth, the thing has become a mystery indeed under our treatment. For in our discussions we have made so many mistakes about plain matters of record, and have emitted so many discordant conjectures, that the whole subject has become entangled to the verge of distraction and is now involved in a kind of druidical mist. Let us try to extricate ourselves from the fogbound labyrinth, and to that end let us examine certain obvious phenomena — for such there are — in an orderly and logical manner, in the light of reason and common sense and of what we know of the habits of literary men.¹

Chaucer's earliest mention of Lollius occurs in *The House of Fame* (1468). The passage is very familiar; but its bearings are often overlooked, and anyhow we must scrutinize it with care at the outset, for it is quite fundamental.

The poet is enumerating the statues erected on pillars in Fame's hall. First comes Josephus, who, with the help of seven others (unnamed) supports the burden of Hebrew history. Next stands Statius, expressly designated as the author of the *Thebaid* and the *Achilleis*. Then there is a group of six worthies who "bear up" the fame of Troy: these are Homer, Dares and Dictys,² Lollius, Guido delle Colonne, and Geoffrey of Monmouth. Then we have Virgil, who bears up the fame

¹ The purpose is to sift and review, not to invent new theories, for almost every conceivable theory has already been propounded. A reference to Miss Hammond's invaluable bibliography (*Chaucer*, 1908, pp. 94 ff.) will relieve me of the duty of ticketing the various suggestions, good and bad, with the names of their originators or adherents. For a recent discussion see Imelmann, *Englische Studien*, XLV, 406 ff.

² *Tytus* is probably a scribe's error for *Dytus* (i.e. Dictys). Robert Braham, who signs "The pistle to the reader" in Thomas Marshe's edition of Lydgate's *Troy Book* (1555), speaks of "Daretus the Phrighyan, and Dytus the Grecyan" and of "the labores aswel of Darete as Dyte."

of pious Aeneas; Ovid, who bears up the fame of the god of love; Lucan, who bears up the fame of Caesar and Pompey, and near him all those clerks who celebrate Rome — too many to call by name; then Claudian, who bears up the fame of hell, having written the *De Raptu Proserpinae*. Here Chaucer stops — for

The halle was al ful, ywis,
Of hem that writen olde gestes,
As ben on trees rokes nestes,

and it would have been “a ful confus matere” to finish the catalogue.

Disregarding Lollius for the moment, we note that every single name in this enumeration represents a real person, or one of whose reality Chaucer and his contemporaries had no doubt, and that in every case the author is correctly associated with the subject. The inference is mathematically certain: *When Chaucer composed The House of Fame he believed that there was once a Lollius, long before his time, who had written something about the matter of Troy.* In no other way can we reasonably account for his mentioning Lollius in such a fashion and in such company — along with Homer, Dares, Dictys, Guido delle Colonne, and Geoffrey of Monmouth, precisely as he mentions Josephus as an authority on the wars of the Jews, Virgil on pious Aeneas, and Lucan on Caesar and Pompey. There is no ground for imagining that he felt any more doubt of the reality of Lollius and his work on Troy than he felt of the reality of Josephus and the *Bellum Iudaicum*, or of Virgil and the *Aeneid*, or of Statius and the epic of Thebes, or of Lucan and the *Pharsalia*. He was mistaken, no doubt, and we shall take occasion by-and-by to consider the genesis of his error. For the present, however, we are concerned merely with the isolated fact of the error itself: — Chaucer certainly believed that some Lollius or other had written something of importance about Troy. No matter how he came to think so. The causes of the opinion have nothing to do with the fact of the opinion as a part of the *res gestae* of the case. Later, when Chaucer came to write the *Troilus*, he used Lollius as a part of the fiction; but all that was at this time in the future. His mention of Lollius in *The House of Fame* is not fiction — it is a mistake pure and simple.

Now the mere name Lollius is not a blunder, and it is not an invention. Chaucer neither dreamed it nor made it up, for it is an authentic

nomen gentile borne by a score of historical Romans who have left a record behind them,¹ not to speak of the much larger number whom oblivion has overwhelmed. Chaucer found the name somewhere; he did not manufacture it. This point should never be forgotten.

Furthermore, wherever it was that Chaucer found the name Lollius, he found it, of course, in some context, not all alone by itself on a whited wall. Where the context was, we do not know, nor whether it was long or short, nor what statements it embodied, nor whether it was correctly or incorrectly read by the poet. One thing, however, we do know: to wit, that *the context in which Chaucer discovered the name Lollius conveyed to his mind the distinct impression that Lollius was the author of an important work on Troy*. In consequence of this impression he mentioned him in that capacity in *The House of Fame* along with Homer, Dares, Dictys, Guido, and Geoffrey. It is practically certain that Chaucer had never seen this Lollian work, for it is practically certain that it never existed. Nor was he acquainted with anybody who had ever seen it. Undoubtedly he supposed that it was lost beyond recovery. So much for the first stage of the Lollius question.

The next step brings us to Chaucer's *Troilus*.² When Chaucer came to write this novel, he wished — as all writers of fiction did, and do still — to lend his work an air of truth and authenticity. A ready and familiar device was, and still is, to appeal to some source that might be accepted as authoritative. Benoit and Boccaccio would not answer, for the conditions of the problem required an ancient (or at least an antique) personage, and preferably one who had written in a learned language. Homer was manifestly out of the question. Dares, Dictys, and Geoffrey were likewise unavailable, for their works were current, and notoriously did not contain any such story as that which Chaucer meant to tell. Guido's name might perhaps have been used at a pinch; but he also was well-known and current, and except at a pinch indeed, his dry, compendious, and unsympathetic account of the love affair could not be cited as the source of Chaucer's warm and detailed narrative. For it was not only facts that Chaucer wished to

¹ Von Rohden and Dessau, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, II, 295 ff.

² I postulate that *The House of Fame* was written before the *Troilus*. See the argument in *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, pp. 53-60.

ascribe to his *auctor*, but feelings, since he himself, so he tells us, is an outsider in matters of love:

Of no sentement I this endite,
But out of Latin in my tonge it write (ii, 13-14).

And, in fact, there was no pinch at all. For *Lollius* was at hand, a venerable and veritable Latin name, and his vanished history, just because it had vanished, was precisely the stalking-horse that the fiction needed. Hence, as a part of that fiction, Chaucer credited his material *en bloc* to Lollius, and professed, with a light heart, to be merely a translator from the Latin.¹

In furtherance of his general fiction as to source, and with the same purpose of lending his work an air of truth and vividness and authenticity, Chaucer added a multitude of classical touches that are wanting in the *Filostrato*.² A striking instance of this attempt to give the tale

¹ *Troilus*, ii, 14. The *Troilus* is also called a translation in the Prologue to the *Legend* (A 250, 264, 341, 350, B 324, 370), and Chaucer speaks of it, when pleading his own cause, as reproducing "what-so myn auctour mente" (A 460, B 470). Tyrwhitt's fancy of taking *Latin* in the sense of *latino volgare*, "Italian" (note to *Parson's Tale*, §104; cf. Warton, *History of English Poetry*, addition to I, 385, in vol. II, 1778) was clever and learned, as usual, but it cannot be entertained. For nothing can be clearer than that Chaucer intended (as part of his fiction) to have his readers understand that he was translating from *Latin*, not from some vernacular idiom. Boccaccio, to be sure, speaks of the *Teseide* as written in "latino volgare" (in the prefatory letter) and Chaucer had doubtless read the passage, but that is no reason for imagining that Chaucer felt at liberty to use the English word *Latin* (without "vulgar") for a modern Italian dialect ("mio fiorentino idioma" are Boccaccio's words in the proem to the *Filostrato*). A word in any context means, I take it, what it is meant to mean by the writer and what it is sure to be understood to mean by the reader. When Chaucer wrote "out of Latin in my tonge it write" he knew perfectly well that his readers would understand by "Latin" the language of Virgil and Statius, not the modern speech of Florence or Padua. Indeed, he ensured that understanding further by his reference to "olde clerkes speche" in v, 1854-1855, shortly after his mention of "Virgile, Ovyde, Omer, Lucan, and Stace" in v, 1792. Finally, even if Chaucer had meant "Italian" when he said "Latin," he would none the less have been resorting to a fiction, for he would have been deliberately misleading his contemporaries.

² Boccaccio labored to furnish the *Teseide* with appropriate mythological and other classical accoutrements, but in the *Filostrato* he is sparing of such adornments. The contrast between the two Italian poems is notable. Cf. Crescini, *Contributo agli Studi sul Boccaccio*, pp. 246-247. Since Chaucer was very familiar with the

an ancient — a Trojan — atmosphere is the introduction of Antigone's song of love as "a Trojan song"¹ and the conversation that follows the singing:

"Now, nece," quod Criseyde,
 "Who made this song with so good entente?"
 Antigone answerde anon and seyde,
 "Ma dame, ywis, the goodlieste mayde
 Of greet estat in al the toun of Troye,
 And let her lyf in most honour and ioie."
 "Forsothe, so it semeth by her song!"
 Quod tho Criseyde.²

There is not a word of this song or of the dialogue or of the whole garden scene in the *Filostrato*, and Antigone herself is a character invented by Chaucer. The Trojanizing of the situation, if I may risk the term, is Chaucer's deliberate art. It is quite of a piece with his professing to have got hold of the very words of the *Cantus Troili* (not given in full by Lollius) and to have reproduced them in as close a version as can be made in translating from the Trojan language into our vernacular.³

Equally felicitous and to the same end is Pandarus' quotation of the Epistle of Oenone to Paris. "I am in love myself," says Pandarus to Troilus, "and am quite helpless in my own case, but yet I can assist you in yours. Indeed, my situation is much like that described in a letter that a shepherdess, Oenone by name, wrote once to your brother Paris. You saw the letter, didn't you?" "Why, no!" replies Troilus. "Well," says Pandarus, "this is how it went."

"I woot wel that it fareth thus by me
 As to thy brother Parys an herdesse,
 Which that y-cleped was Oēnone,
 Wrot in a compleynt of hir hevynesse:
 Ye say the lettre that she wroot, y gesse?"
 "Nay, never yet, y-wis," quod Troilus.
 "Now," quod Pandare, "herketh; it was thus."⁴

Teseide when he wrote the *Troilus*, and used it several times in that poem, we may recognize the general influence of the *Teseide* in the passages we are now considering (cf. H. M. Cummings, *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio*, p. 67).

¹ ii, 825.

² ii, 877-884.

³ i, 393 ff. Cf. p. 93.

⁴ i, 652-658.

An extract follows, adapted from the *Heroides*.¹ There is nothing about this letter in the *Filostrato*. Chaucer's device in making Pandarus profess to have seen the original, in Oenone's own handwriting, is obviously akin to the device involved in his whole Lollian fiction. It is a wonder that some critic has not accused him of fraud because he did not insert a credit to Ovid.

Another detail to the same general purport is Pandarus's casual reference to the petrified Queen Niobe as one of the sights of the day:

" For this nis not, certeyn, the nexte wyse
To winnen love, as techen us the wyse,
To walwe and wepe as Niobe the quene,
Whos teres yet in marbel been ysene." ²

This, too, is of course not in the *Filostrato*. One would know that well enough without taking heed to one's books.

We cannot pause to study all the classical touches that Chaucer has added to the story, but a few more must be merely enumerated, because of their important bearing on his design. Thus he makes Pandarus compare the sufferings of Troilus to the agony of Tityus torn by the vultures,³ and curse himself with a reference to Cerberus.⁴ His characters swear by Minerva and Jupiter,⁵ by Neptune,⁶ by Mars,⁷ by Venus,⁸ by "natal Ioves fest,"⁹ by Pallas,¹⁰ and so on. He describes Cressid's servants as thronging 'to see Troilus ride up the street from the Gate of Dardanus;¹¹ he puts into Pandarus' mouth directions for a love-letter that are adapted from Ovid and the *Ars Poetica*;¹² he brings a Greek spy into Troy with tidings — apparently a person who has just been captured or a knave who is playing a double game;¹³ he introduces the episode of a visit to Deiphobus, full of intimate detail of the royal *ménage*;¹⁴ he makes Cressida speak of Antenor and Aeneas

¹ *Troilus*, i, 659-665; *Heroides*, v, 147-154 (see p. 113, below).

² i, 697-700.

³ i, 785 ff.

⁴ "To Cerberus in helle ay be I bounde" (i, 859). Cf. *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel, II, 330: "Ou me lie en corde ou en fer Cerberus li portiers d'enfer."

⁵ ii, 232-233.

¹⁰ v, 977.

⁶ ii, 443.

¹¹ ii, 614-618.

⁷ ii, 593.

¹² ii, 1023-1043.

⁸ ii, 1524.

¹³ ii, 1111-1113.

⁹ iii, 150.

¹⁴ ii, 1394 ff.

(well-known to mediaeval readers as the traitors of the cycle) as lending their support to a lawsuit about property brought against her by false Poliphete;¹ he lets Troilus pretend to keep vigil in Apollo's temple to see the "holy laurer quake" and to get an oracle for the conduct of the war.² With similar regard for local and contemporary color Pandarus swears "by stocks and stones" and by the gods that dwell in heaven, and damns himself, if his speech be false, to abide as deep in hell as Tantalus.³ Troilus adjures Venus by her love of Adonis whom she loved "in the shawe," and, continuing his prayer, appeals to Jove (for love of Europa), to Mars (for love of Venus), to Phoebus (for love of Daphne), to Mercury (for love of Herse), to Diana, and the Fatal Sisters.⁴ Again, he wishes that his night with Cressida might be as long as Jupiter's with Alcmena⁵ and chides Titan⁶ for allowing the Dawn to leave his side so early.⁷ Calchas assures the Greeks that Phoebus and Neptune are determined to bring Troy to destruction because Laomedon refused them their hire.⁸ Troilus vows that he will love Cressida after he is dead and dwelling in torment with Proserpine,⁹ but she, more sanguine, hopes to live with him in the Elysian Fields, like Orpheus and Eurydice.¹⁰ She swears by all celestial gods, by every nymph and infernal deity, and by the satyrs and fauns, "that halve-goddess ben of wildernesse," and she calls upon Atropos to break her thread if ever she prove false,¹¹ and declares that Simois that runs through Troy shall turn back its current before she will be unfaithful.¹²

All of these touches of antiquity — and enough more to make up about a hundred — are Chaucer's own, and not taken from the *Filostrato*. Their significance depends upon their number, and upon the fact that they are in the main quite apposite. Critics, to be sure,

¹ ii, 1463-1475, 1616.

³ iii, 589-593.

² iii, 540-546.

⁴ iii, 718-735.

⁵ iii, 1427-1428.

⁶ On Chaucer's error in substituting Titan for Tithonus, see p. 116, below.

⁷ iii, 1464-1470.

⁸ iv, 120-126.

⁹ iv, 470-476 (cf. *Teseide*, x, 106).

¹⁰ iv, 785-791. "In the feld of *pitee*, out of *peyne*, That hight *Elysos*," looks as if Chaucer etymologized *Elysios* with reference to (*Kyrie*) *eleison*. Cf. Ovid's "*arva piorum*," *Met.*, xi, 62 (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXIV, 352, n. 14).

¹¹ iv, 1541-1547.

¹² iv, 1548-1553 (cf. *Heroides*, v, 27-31; *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel, II, 83).

are prone to dismiss them as mere "classical allusions," or as bits of decoration, or even as symptoms of a desire to show off. This is futile treatment. Nothing can be clearer than that such things *in this poem* — whatever they may be elsewhere in the middle ages or in the eighteenth century — are present as parts of an artistic design. They are meant to produce or to intensify an atmosphere of high antiquity — a Trojan or Lollian atmosphere. Chaucer pretends — in an artistic fiction — to be translating from an ancient author, and he tries to make his characters talk and think like persons of the heroic age in such matters of detail as do not interfere with their truth to eternal and unchanging humanity. He could not dig up Troy. It was out of his power to archaeologize in dress and manners and topography. But he could make Pandarus swear like a heathen of the heroic age, and speak familiarly of the letter he had seen that Oenone wrote to Paris, and refer to Niobe and her tears as still visible in stone — one of the wonders of the world:

"Niobe the quene,
Whos teres yet in marbel been ysene."

And all this he did, and much more, with the same artistic purpose that had prompted him to describe his whole poem as translated from an ancient Latin author — one Lollius, whose long-buried work he had been lucky enough to disinter.

Chaucer names Lollius only twice in the *Troilus*,¹ but he keeps him constantly in the reader's memory by mentioning him as his *auctor* and by other more or less definite references and allusions. Altogether there are about forty such passages, or an average of one to about two hundred verses, though they are by no means regularly apportioned. Their effect upon the mind is uniform and cumulative, nor can there be any doubt, in a poem so carefully finished, that this effect was deliberately intended. In short, Chaucer takes quite particular pains to convey the impression that his *Troilus*, from beginning to end, is a faithful translation from the Latin work of Lollius, without any material additions either from other sources or from his own pen. Sometimes, to be sure, he professes or implies condensation, and now and then he suggests that he has occasionally consulted the well-known

¹ i, 394; v, 1653.

authorities,¹ but these remarks are never made in such a way as to diminish the impression of thoroughgoing fidelity to Lollius. On the contrary, they strengthen that impression, for they always imply either that Lollius agrees with other authorities in the detail in question, or that the poet never departs from Lollius, even in a trifle, without due notice. Lollius, then, in Chaucer's fiction, is not Boccaccio or Benoit or Guido or Statius or Ovid or Boëthius: *he is simply Lollius*, an alleged Latin author on the Trojan War, to whom Chaucer chooses, for his artistic purposes, to credit practically everything that the *Troilus* contains — everything, that is, that Chaucer drew from Boccaccio and Benoit and Guido and Statius and Ovid and Boëthius, and likewise everything that he drew from the brain of Geoffrey Chaucer. In other words, Chaucer's pretended use of Lollius is not an acknowledgement of obligations to Boccaccio or to anybody else: it is a fiction, deliberately adopted in advance, impressed upon the reader with all the emphasis of which the poet is capable, and fostered and supported by repeated assertion and skilful innuendo.

Here we must be on our guard against taking the poet too seriously. Chaucer counted on two classes of contemporary readers: first, the gentlemen and some of the ladies of his time, who were cultivated but not scholarly; and second, a very limited group of men of learning, like Gower and Strode, the pair to whom the *Troilus* is dedicated. If the first class accepted his citation as gospel truth, and were convinced that he had unearthed a Trojan history by one Lollius in some old parchment volume, well and good! If the second class saw through

¹ Chaucer twice distinguishes sharply between the usual story of Troy, to be found in Homer and Dictys and Dares, and the particular Trojan story that he has in hand in the *Troilus*. One of these distinguishing passages comes very early in the poem (i, 141-147), the other is near the end (v. 1765-1771).

All the passages in which Chaucer refers or alludes to an *auctor* or a source are collected and discussed in Appendix I (pp. 92-109, below). This appendix the reader is advised to ignore if he agrees with my assertions. If he dissents, I beg him to peruse only enough of it to convince him. The chief reason for the existence of this appendix is the elaborate and ingenious argument of Dr. H. M. Cummings in Chapter viii of his substantial dissertation on *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio* (Cincinnati, 1916) — an argument which arrives at results that differ *toto caelo* from what seems to me the plain meaning of the evidence. It is only fair to add that I have found Dr. Cummings's monograph very useful in many ways.

the device and recognized Lollius as a part of the fiction, still well and good! Everybody would be content. The ladies and gentlemen would raise no question anyhow; the scholars would compliment him on the success of his poetic device. Nobody would make trouble until modern scholarship should come into existence, with its artificially stimulated craving for literary facts — and Chaucer was under no obligation to quench the thirst of modern scholarship.

Another caution seems to be necessary at this point, though one would suppose a sense of humor might have provided for it in advance. Chaucer's pretence of drawing his plot and sentiments from the Latin work of one Lollius is an artistic device, not a fraud. It has just as much and just as little to do with *veracity* as Addison's pretending to translate the Vision of Mirzah from a manuscript that he "picked up when he was at Grand Cairo," or Goldsmith's crediting *The Citizen of the World* to a Chinese sage, or Hawthorne's calling *Rappaccini's Daughter* a translation from the "Beatrice; ou la Belle Empoisonneuse" of M. de l'Aubépine, the author of "L'Artiste du Beau; ou le Papillon Mécanique" in five volumes quarto; or Mr. Maurice Hewlett's pretending to utilize, for his *Richard Yea and Nay*, a chronicle by one "Milo, a Carthusian monk, abbot of the cloister of Saint Mary-of-the-Pine by Poitiers," who enjoyed the distinction of being "the life-long friend" of King Richard himself — a real person, by the way, whose account of the "acta" of Richard I exists no longer.¹ I cannot refrain from quoting a recent critic of Mr. Hewlett, merely to show how different is the spirit in which we judge our contemporary romancers and their clever tricks, from the stodgy mixture of naïve literalness and moral fervor that dominates us when we appraise Chaucer. "It is from the writings of this priest," says Mr. Milton Bonner, "that Mr. Hewlett pretends to draw justification for his inventions. The extracts from Milo's supposititious history lend just the air of verity that we needed to help overcome scruples when confronted by certain aspects of the story."²

Here, perhaps, is the place to compare Chaucer's artistic device in the *Troilus* with his procedure in several of the *Canterbury Tales*.

¹ See Stubbs, *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I*, I, xxxiii-xxxiv.

² Maurice Hewlett, Boston, 1910, p. 81.

The Miller's Tale and the *Reeve's* are fabliaux worked up, doubtless, from the French; yet Chaucer makes the Miller localize the story at Oxford,¹ and the Reeve lays the scene of the adventure with which he replies to the Miller, at Trumpington, near Cambridge, where there is a brook with a bridge and a mill, emphasizing his story as "verray sooth."² *The Cook's Tale* is "a litel iape that fil in our citee" of London.³ *The Friar's Tale*, in like manner, is of persons well-known "in my contree,"⁴ and his opponent the Sumner is earnest enough in denouncing it as a lie.⁵ Yet he localizes his own anecdote in a marshy district called Holderness in Yorkshire.⁶ Even the Nun's Priest follows the fashion, though with a deliciously ironical innuendo:

"This storie is also trewe, I undertake,
As is the book of Launcelot de Lake,
That wommen holde in ful great reverence."⁷

Particularly enlightening with regard to Chaucer's methods as a writer of fiction are the words of the Man of Law in praise of merchants. "Ye are the fathers of tidings," says the lawyer, "and of tales, both those of peace and those of strife!

"I were right now of tales desolat,
Nere that a marchaunt, goon is many a yere,
Me taughte a tale, which that ye shal here."⁸

Then follows the story of Constance, which is taken for the most part from Nicholas Trivet's chronicle, though Trivet might never have walked the earth for anything that Chaucer says about him.

Nowhere, in short, does Chaucer, in his capacity of writer of fiction, recognize any obligation whatever to cite the actual source of his material, or scruple to lend an air of truth and reality to his stories by including express statements as to source or scene that bear no relation whatever to the facts. We have as much, and as little, reason to be surprised at his ascription of the *Troilus* to somebody different from Boccaccio as to be surprised at his pretending to have dreamed *The*

¹ A 3187. On these localizing touches cf. Tatlock, *The Scene of the Franklin's Tale Visited*, p. 70, note 1.

² A 3921-3924.

³ A 4343.

⁴ D 1299.

⁵ D 1670.

⁶ D 1709-1712.

⁷ B 4401-4403.

⁸ B 129-133.

Book of the Duchess and the *House of Fame*. In the latter case, we recall, he mentions the very month and day on which he had the vision!¹

Let us next consider the attitude of Chaucer's immediate circle toward his ascription of the *Troilus* material to Lollius. The poem is dedicated to John Gower and Ralph Strode. Did these scholarly persons accept this ascription as a matter of fact? Of course not. Strode was a professional philosopher, and must instantly have recognized the complaint of Cressida² and the song of Troilus³ in the Third Book and the long soliloquy of Troilus in Book Fourth,⁴ as founded on Boëthius. This information, indeed, was within the reach of any Englishman who had access to a copy of Chaucer's own version, if, as is altogether likely, this had been published before the *Troilus* came out. Gower, for his part, might be trusted to detect the borrowings from Ovid, whose works he knew almost by heart. In particular, he could not miss the quotation in Book i⁵ from Oenone's epistle in the *Heroides*,⁶ which Chaucer himself had sufficiently labelled for any half-educated reader by making Pandarus introduce it as an extract from "the letter that she wrote."⁷ Neither Gower nor Strode could fail to perceive that Cassandra's account of the Theban contest⁸ was drawn from Statius, even if Chaucer himself is not responsible for the insertion of the twelve lines of Latin that give the argument of the twelve books of the *Thebaid*.⁹ As for the story of Troilus in general, it was perfectly familiar to Gower in one of his favorite volumes, the *Roman de Troie*,¹⁰ and he could scarcely have overlooked all of the numerous passages for which Chaucer is indebted to Benoit.¹¹

This accumulation of "details tending to prove" may seem absurd in so plain a case, but the reader will pardon it if he recollects the in-

¹ *House of Fame*, 63.

² iii, 813-836; Boëthius, ii, prose 4.

³ iii, 1744-1771; Boëthius, ii, metre 8.

⁴ iv, 958-1078; Boëthius, v, pr. 2 and 3.

⁵ i, 659-665 (cf. p. 113, below).

⁶ v, 147-154.

⁸ v, 1485-1510.

⁷ i, 656.

⁹ After v, 1498.

¹⁰ See Kittredge, *Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, pp. 4-7.

¹¹ See Young, *Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Criseyde*, pp. 105 ff.

clination of scholars to judge the middle ages as a time apart, when nobody thought or felt or acted as men do now-a-days. There was, we are told, a childlike faith in authority — the written word was always accepted at its face value. Perhaps so — though I doubt it vehemently — but that has nothing to do with what passed between man and man in the give-and-take of ordinary life. Gower and Strode might have accepted a citation of Lollius as a sober acknowledgment of genuine indebtedness if they had seen it in Vincent of Beauvais or John of Salisbury; but they knew the difference between an encyclopaedist or a philosopher and a romancing poet, and they knew Geoffrey Chaucer in his habit as he lived. How many of his readers Mr. Hewlett took in with his Abbot Milo, who shall tell? Not many, I fancy, among the better educated; none at all, I am sure, among his personal friends. Nor did Mr. Hewlett desire to take anybody in. He simply wished to heighten the verisimilitude of his romance by means of an ancient and well-accredited device.

But let us return to Strode and Gower. Can there be the slightest doubt that Chaucer told these intimate friends of his all he knew about the *Filostrato* months before he began to work at his own adaptation, or that, as time went on, he read parts of the *Troilus* to them and talked over his plans with regard to the work, including the felicitous idea of ascribing it to one Lollius? At the outset we purposed to examine such probabilities in the light not only of reason and common sense but also of the habits of literary men. Are we to assume that Chaucer never discussed his poems while he was writing them?

Chaucer's immediate circle, then, knew well enough, when the *Troilus* appeared, that he had drawn much of his material from an Italian poet, and none of it from Lollius. He made no secret of the matter; indeed, he could not have mystified them if he had wished. Nor is there any likelihood that he swore them to secrecy when he took them into his confidence. He was composing a romantic novel, not forging a will. And, beyond any reasonable question, the fact that the *Troilus* came largely from an Italian poem was soon a matter of common knowledge, with Chaucer's hearty consent, among all such persons as took an interest in him and his works.

For this last proposition, however, we need not depend upon general probabilities. There is a distinct piece of positive evidence that

establishes it beyond a peradventure. I refer to a notorious passage in Lydgate, which has been stretched upon the rack a score of times to elicit confessions of things that it could not confess, but has never, I think, been interrogated with regard to the single point on which it is really competent to testify and quite ready to speak without compulsion.

In youth he made a translacion
Of a booke which called is Trophe
In Lumbard tong, as men may reade and see,
And in our vulgare, long or that he deyed,
Gauē it the name of Troylous and Cresseyde.¹

Lydgate is a muddled witness, as usual. Still, the difficulties in the present case are by no means staggering. "In his youth" is too early, but Lydgate knew nothing about the minutiae of Chaucerian chronology, and the question of dates does not here concern us. "Trophe" is a manifest blunder. There is no chance whatever that the *Filostrato*, or anything else that Chaucer used in the *Troilus*, was ever called by any such name. The blunder is due to mere confusion of memory. Lydgate had read *The Monk's Tale*, where Chaucer cites "Trophe" as an authority on the Pillars of Hercules,² and he shifted the application in a moment of paramnesia. Chaucer's "Trophee" may be a mystery,³ but Lydgate's is not. It has no foundation or genesis save in this passage of *The Monk's Tale*, misapplied by a constitutional blunderer, and it need trouble us no more.

What remains, then, of our quotation from Lydgate? Simply this: the statement that Chaucer translated his *Troilus* from a book "in Lombard tongue"—that is, in Italian. In other words, good Dan John, about a generation after Chaucer's death, was well aware that the source of the *Troilus* was not a Latin book by Lollius, but a book in the Italian language. How did Lydgate know? Why, from the common talk of literary men, passed down by immediate tradition

¹ *Falls of Princes*, Prologue (ed. 1554, Tottell, sig. A. ii v^o; ed. 1558, Wayland, sig. A. ii v^o).

² B 3307.

³ For some recent conjectures see my essay on *The Pillars of Hercules and Chaucer's "Trophee,"* in the *Putnam Anniversary Volume*, 1909, pp. 545 ff.; Tupper, *Modern Language Notes*, XXXI, 11; Emerson, in the same, XXXI, 142.

from the contemporaries of Chaucer himself.¹ In other words, there had never been any secret about the derivation of the *Troilus* from the *Filostrato*. Chaucer's citation of Lollius was not deceit, but transparent literary artifice. Anybody who asked the facts was at liberty to learn them. They were matters of general knowledge among Chaucer's friends and the court circle in general.

Much dust has been raised over Chaucer's neglect or omission to mention the name of Boccaccio anywhere. Let us examine the matter. The places in which moderns look in vain for some reference to Boccaccio are the *Troilus*, *The Knight's Tale*, *Anelida and Arcite*, *The Monk's Tale*, and *The Clerk's Tale*.²

The *Troilus* we have already considered, and to it we shall later return. What has there been said applies in general (except so far as Lollius is concerned) to *The Knight's Tale*. I can see no reason why Chaucer should have mentioned, or made the knight mention, the direct source of the story, any more than in the case of the other *Canterbury Tales*. For almost every one of these Chaucer had a source; but he has seldom mentioned it. In several instances the teller of the story insists on its truth and undertakes to localize it in England. In no one of all these cases has anybody expressed amazement at Chaucer's fiction in localizing, which is, of course, precisely similar to that of giving your story (if it deals with ancient times) an air of antiquity

¹ We should observe that Lydgate does not connect Lollius with "Trophee" or assert that Chaucer took the *Troilus* from Lollius. On the contrary, his assertion that Chaucer translated from the Italian records a piece of information which amounts to an express denial that Chaucer's source was a Latin writer — whether Lollius or anybody else. When Lydgate mentions Lollius, as he does (once) in the *Troy Book*, he refers to him not as an author used by Chaucer anywhere, but simply as a person who wrote about the siege of Troy. "And of this sege wrot eke Lollius" (ed. Bergen. *Prol.*, 309). This information Lydgate doubtless got from *The House of Fame*. He did not accept the statement of Chaucer that he translated the *Troilus* from Lollius' Latin, for he had better information; but he did accept the statement that there once was a Lollius who composed a work on the Trojan history.

² Nobody, I believe, expresses amazement at Chaucer's failure to mention Boccaccio in *The Parliament of Fowls* or the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*. As to *The Franklin's Tale*, if the source was really Boccaccio (a question not here in place to debate), one has but to compare the stories to see that Chaucer must have had a pedant's conscience if he had felt obliged to refer to Boccaccio for a performance that was so marvellously his own. And what, in turn, was Boccaccio's source, and why did not *he* refer to it?

by suppressing the name of your actual modern authority and referring either to some definite Lollius (as in *Troilus*) or in general to the "old stories" or "old books,"¹ which is what the knight does:

As olde bokes seyn
That al this storie tellen more pleyn.²

Once, indeed, he adds Statius to the other old books:

As men may biholde
In Stace of Thebes, and thise bokes olde (2293-2294).³

The particular thing is in the *Teseide*, vii, 72, not in Statius.³ Note that there is absolutely no claim to originality. Throughout the poem, the knight protests, again and again, that he is condensing a tale that he has read.⁴ For my part, I can see no reason in literary morals for mentioning Boccaccio, and I cannot fail to see abundant reason, in good art, for doing exactly what Chaucer has done. If it be objected that *The Knight's Tale* is a big thing, and that therefore Chaucer was under more pressing obligation to mention his source than in the case of the anonymous fabliaux, I will take refuge in the *Melibee*, where also the author is not mentioned, and there is likewise no pretence of originality. Surely, the most mathematically minded of moderns can grasp the general fact that, when a mediaeval writer professed to be following some *auctor* or other, thus declining all merit of originality, he was under no sort of obligation to specify who that *auctor* really was. Chaucer, at all events, acknowledged no such obligation. His practice was to do so only when to refer to the source would add to the authority or verisimilitude. In *The Knight's Tale*, a reference to

¹ A 859, 1198, 1463, 2155.

² A 1463-1464.

³ Dr. Wise makes an ingenious defence of what he calls Chaucer's "good faith" in this reference. By "hir thinges," he says, "Chaucer probably means such sacrificial rites as Boccaccio describes, *Tes.* vii. 75," and he goes on to show that similar rites *are* described (though not credited to Emilia, of course) in the *Thebaid* (*The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, pp. 98-100). Very likely Chaucer had this fact in mind, but that does not change the other fact, — namely, that he deliberately undertakes, both here and elsewhere, to produce the impression that he is following an ancient author in telling the story of Palamon and Arcite.

⁴ A 875-892, 985, 994-1000, 1187-1190, 1201, 1341, 1358, 1377-1380, 1417, 1461, 1463-1464, 1480, 1782, 1895, 1935, 1953-1954, 2039-2040, 2052, 2073-2074, 2197-2208, 2263-2264, 2284-2288, 2820-2821, 2919-2966.

Boccaccio's *Teseide* would, on the contrary, have decreased this effect. It would have been inartistic pedantry. Let it here be remembered that in the one Canterbury Tale which Chaucer invented (*Sir Thopas*) he fictitiously declines to pass as the author. It is the only story he knows — "a rym I lerned longe agoon,"¹ and "the beste rym I can."²

That Chaucer did not mention Boccaccio in connection with the *Anelida* would never have attracted a moment's attention, were it not that scholars were busied in rolling up a cumulative case. We shall return to this fragment presently.

In *The Clerk's Tale*, that scholar refers in the most definite and particular way to Petrarch. The reference completely covers the borrowing. There was no call to give the earlier history of the document anyhow, whether Chaucer knew it (from Petrarch's preliminary letter) or not. That a definite and correct source is here referred to is a part of the drama. This is exactly what one would expect the Clerk, a scholar, to do, and it was certainly in keeping with the situation for him to refer to a clerk who praised a woman, for he was answering the Wife of Bath, who had declared that such a case had never been heard of. Here to refer to the exact source, then, was as artistic on Chaucer's part as *not* to refer to it in the other cases. However, the point we are discussing — why does Chaucer never refer to Boccaccio by name? — is neither advanced nor retarded by this instance. It is answer enough to say: He does not refer to Boccaccio because he got the tale from Petrarch. The fiction here — for there is almost always a fiction — consists in the Clerk's assertion that Petrarch *told* him the story in person at Padua.

And so we come to *The Monk's Tale* — where, and where alone, there is a real puzzle. For here, in the account of Zenobia, which comes from Boccaccio's *De Claris Mulieribus*, the Monk refers to "my maister Petrak." Why, I do not know, — perhaps because Chaucer thought him a more appropriate author than Boccaccio for the decorous and stately Monk to cite. That, at all events, would be reason enough. As to lapse of memory, or confusion — that, too would certainly have been easy. Almost all the Zenobia comes from Boccaccio's treatise *De Claris Mulieribus*, — only a bit from the *De Casibus* — and

¹ B 1898-1899.

² B 2118.

what more likely than that Chaucer should have confused this in his memory with Petrarch's work with a similar title, *De Viris Illustribus*? Petrarch does speak of Zenobia in the *Trionfo della Fama* (ii, 107-117, ed. Appel, p. 255); but I see no reason to believe that Chaucer was acquainted with that poem.

Since we are on the subject of "Boccaccio and obligations," may it not be enlightening to observe how Boccaccio himself proceeded in the matter of acknowledging indebtedness? First, the *Teseide*. In the dedicatory letter to la Fiammetta, Boccaccio asserts that he came across a very ancient history, unknown to most people,¹ and this he has turned into Italian rhyme. In the second stanza of the poem itself he repeats this statement, declaring that he is about to write in rhyme an ancient history, so buried and hidden in years that no Latin author says anything about it, to the best of his knowledge and belief:

E' m'è venuta voglia con pietosa
Rima di scriver una storia antica,
Tanto negli anni riposta e nascosa,
Che latino autor non par ne dica,
Per quel ch' i' senta, in libro alcuna cosa.²

A very large part of the *Teseide* is borrowed from the *Thebaid*.³ Yet Statius is nowhere cited, for it is Boccaccio's deliberate intention to refer his epic to a source known only to himself, — to a lost author whom he has had the luck to discover. Now when Chaucer wrote the *Troilus*, he was well acquainted with both the *Thebaid* and the *Teseide*.⁴ Of course, then, he saw whence the Italian poet had derived a large part of his material, never scrupling to translate literally. Nor could he fail to appreciate the wisdom and artistic justification of Boccaccio's pretence about the lost author so happily discovered by him. Here let it be noted that Chaucer's debt to Boccaccio in the *Troilus* is for almost exactly one third of his poem — precisely the

¹ "Trovata una antichissima storia, e al più delle genti non manifesta" (p. 3).

² This passage makes the question whether Chaucer knew the dedicatory letter to la Fiammetta a matter of indifference in our discussion. Cf. *Teseide*, xii, 84-85. Note also "Sì gli nasconde in sè la lunga etade," vi, 64 (*Aeneid*, v, 302), and in particular "se il ver l'antichità ragiona," xii, 53, where the poet is describing Emilia.

³ See pp. 121 ff., below for details.

⁴ On Chaucer's use of the *Teseide* in the *Troilus*, see pp. 110 ff., below.

amount of Boccaccio's debt to Statius in the *Teseide*. It's a poor rule that won't work both ways: yet I have heard nobody express surprise at Boccaccio's silence about his debt to Statius.

When we examine the *Filostrato*, we observe a state of things no less interesting and significant. Boccaccio assures his lady in the *Proemio* that he found it impossible to conceal his feelings of love and sorrow without dying. He determined, therefore, to relieve them by utterance, and, by a kind of divine inspiration, he hit upon the idea of relating them in song in the character of some lover whose sufferings resembled his own. "Meco adunque con sollecita cura cominciai a rivolgere l'antiche storie, per trovare cui potesse verisimilmente fare scudo del mio segreto e amoroso dolore." No personage that was better adapted to this purpose occurred to him than "il valoroso giovane Troilo," son of the noble Priam, king of Troy; for the life of Troilus, in that it was sorrowful on account of love and the absence of Criseida, "se fede alcuna alle antiche storie si può dare," was very similar to Boccaccio's own after the departure of his lady. Therefore he composed the *Filostrato*. "When you find Troilus," he adds, "lamenting the departure of Criseida, you will be able to comprehend my words, my tears, my sighs, and my anguish; when he praises Criseida you may understand that I am praising you. The other matters, however, concerning his previous felicity, have no reference to me. I have inserted them because they are found in the history of that noble lover."¹

The Italian poet, then, here as in the *Teseide*, professes to have drawn his material from some ancient author, to whose work he refers as *la storia* more than once in the course of the poem.² As a matter of fact, he derived the story of Troilus and Cressida from the *Roman de Troie* of Benoit de Sainte Maure, and utilized Guido delle Colonne to some extent;³ but neither of these writers did he deign to mention, wisely and artistically preferring to lend his poem the authority of

¹ L'altre cose [besides the laments and the praises of the lady], che oltre a queste vi sono assai, niuna, siccome già dissi, a me non appartiene, nè per me vi si pone, ma perchè la storia nel nobile innamorato giovane lo richiede (p. 9).

² See i, 16, 46; iii, 90; cf. i, 48.

³ See Young, *The Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Criseyde*, 1908, for details.

an unnamed ancient. Like Chaucer, Boccaccio credits to this ancient not only all that he has borrowed from anybody, but also all that he has invented himself.

Now Chaucer was just as familiar with Benoit as Boccaccio was;¹ and, as in the case of the *Teseide* he had noted the Italian's unacknowledged debt to Statius, so in the case of the *Filostrato* he noted his unacknowledged debt to Benoit.² This debt, he saw, was substantial; yet Boccaccio had not only ignored it but had taken pains to divert attention from Benoit by insisting on a very "ancient" source. Further, Chaucer observed (no doubt with pleasure) that in the *Teseide* Boccaccio had appealed to a history so old as not to be mentioned by the [known and extant] Latin writers — that is, to a lost document which the Italian poet had had the good fortune to find.

Chaucer was an apt pupil, and he took all the hints. He suppressed the name of Boccaccio in the *Troilus* as Boccaccio had suppressed the name of Benoit in the *Filostrato*, and he ascribed his poem to an ancient Latin writer. Further, he improved upon the fiction that his master had used in the *Teseide*. He actually knew (so he thought) the name of an ancient who had written a lost work on the Trojan War — one Lollius — and so he not only pretended to have found a manuscript known to few or none of his contemporaries, but gave the very name of the author whom he professed to follow.

That Chaucer did in very truth get the suggestion for the Lollian fiction (except for the name) from Boccaccio in the manner just indicated, and from the Italian passages just referred to, is fortunately not a matter of conjecture or even of mere inference. For we may be quite certain that he read with care both the *Proemio* to the *Filostrato* and the second stanza of the *Teseide*. As to the *Proemio*, his eager disclaimer of personal knowledge of a lover's feelings, his profession of being an outsider in such matters,³ is a clear and deliberate reversal

¹ See *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXIV, 344 ff.

² It may no doubt be alleged that Boccaccio's indebtedness to Benoit in the *Filostrato* is not so large *in bulk* as Chaucer's indebtedness to Boccaccio in the *Troilus*; but that does not signify. Boccaccio's debt to Benoit was substantial — without Benoit there would have been no *Filostrato*. Yet Boccaccio not only ignores Benoit, but takes pains to divert attention from him by insisting on an "ancient" source.

³ *Troilus*, ii, 8-21.

of the situation of Boccaccio as there described.¹ As to the second stanza of the *Teseide*, the evidence is still more striking, for Chaucer, before he composed either the *Palamon* or the *Troilus*, had actually utilized that stanza as the second stanza of his unfinished *Anelida and Arcite*.

E' m' è venuta voglia con pietosa
Rima di scriver una storia antica,
Tanto negli anni riposta e nascosa,
Che latino autor non par ne dica,
Per quel ch' i' senta, in libro alcuna cosa.²

For it ful depe is sonken in my minde
With pitous herte in English for tendyte
This olde storie, in Latin which I finde,
Of quene Anelida and fals Arcita,
That elde, which that al can frete and byte,
As it hath freten many a noble storie,
Hath nigh devoured out of our memorie.³

The indebtedness of the introductory stanzas of *Anelida* to the introductory stanzas of the *Teseide* was noted years ago by ten Brink;⁴ but the bearing of the situation on the Lollian fiction in the *Troilus*

¹ If this does not suffice, we may clinch the matter by comparing *Troilus*, v, 666-679, with *Filostrato*, v, 70, and with a passage in the *Proemio*. Stanza 70 gave Chaucer a part of his lines, but 671-672 are straight from the *Proemio*:

And thennes comth this eyr, that is so swote
That in my soule I fele it doth me bote.

"Quindi ogni *aura*, ogni *soave vento* che di colà viene, così nel viso ricevo, quasi il vostro senza niuno fallo abbia tocco: nè è perciò troppo lungo *questo miligamento*" (p. 4).

² *Teseide*, i, 2. Cf. the preliminary letter to la Fiammetta: — "Trovata una antichissima storia, e al più delle genti non manifesta" (p. 3).

³ *Anelida*, st. 2. The first ten stanzas of the *Anelida* have their sources as follows: — 1-3 in *Teseide*, i, 1-3 (in reverse order, 3, 2, 1); 4-7 in *Thebaid*, xii, 519-535, with a touch from *Teseide*, ii, 22, in stanza 6; 8-10 in *Teseide*, ii, 10-12. With stanza 11 Chaucer begins to be original and he so continues. At the end of the fragment he is about to describe the temple of Mars, and here, of course, imitation of Statius or of the *Teseide* (or of both) would have come in again. But the story in general was certainly to be from neither Statius nor Boccaccio, nor, indeed, from any work that scholars have been able to name or even to guess at. Skeat has well noted the resemblance to the story of the falcon in *The Squire's Tale* (*Oxford Chaucer*, I, 534).

⁴ *Chaucer, Studien*, 1870, pp. 49-53.

hardly seems to have been perceived. Chaucer's procedure in the two poems is practically the same. In the *Anelida* he adopts from the *Teseide* Boccaccio's fiction of having discovered a lost or forgotten piece of ancient history, and expressly declares that he is about to translate it from the Latin.¹ In the *Troilus*, as we have seen, he adopts the very same fiction, improving upon it by actually naming the Latin writer — one Lollius — whom he pretends to translate faithfully.²

¹ A reminiscence of Boccaccio's fiction in the *Teseide* as to a source very ancient and therefore little known — an echo, indeed, of his very words — occurs also in the defence of Chaucer by Alcestis in the *Legend*:

He made the book that hight the Hous of Fame,
And ek the Deeth of Blaunche the Duchesse,
And the Parlement of Foules, as I gesse,
And al the love of Palamon and Arcite, —
Of Thebes, thogh the storie is knowen lyte, —
And many an ympne for your holydayes (A 405-410, B 417-422).

That is, "Chaucer wrote all the love of Palamoun and Arcite" and then, parenthetically, "they were of Thebes, although (unlike the tale of Cadmus and Oedipus and Eteocles and Polynices — the regular Theban cycle) their particular history is not included in the ordinary accounts of Thebes, and is therefore comparatively little known." It is, as Boccaccio has said, "al più delle genti non manifesta," "negli anni riposta e nascosa." In saying that "the *story* is little known," Chaucer is not speaking of his own special version, but of the *story itself*, i.e. the *history*, the *old tale*. This interpretation (which accords with the regular meaning of *story* in Chaucer, and which completely justifies the *though*) is, in the main, that of ten Brink and Skeat. It removes the passage from its consecrated position as an indication of chronology, for what Alcestis says is, in effect, "He has told the little-known history of Palamon and Arcite," not "He has told the history of Palamon and Arcite, but his poem has attracted slight attention." Thus we are left free to put the *Palamon* where it belongs, before the *Troilus* (see p. 69, note).

² Cf. *Anelida* (as just quoted) with *Troilus*, ii, 13-14: "Of no sentement I this endyte, But out of Latin in [= into] my tonge it write." Note also that the *Troilus* is called a translation in *The Legend of Good Women*, A 350 (B 370), cf. A 250 (B 324).

I think the parallel may be carried still farther. In the *Anelida*, after declaring that he is to translate from the Latin an old and almost forgotten story, Chaucer concludes his proem with the avowal, "First follow I Stace, and after him Corinne" (21). In fact he follows Statius (and the *Teseide*) for the next seven stanzas (4-10) and then begins to invent. At stanza 11, then, we are to suppose that he begins his pretended translation from Corinne — a Theban story. The most natural inference is that Chaucer somehow got hold of the name of Corinna and found her described as a famous Theban poetess, and that he accordingly utilized her name as he utilized that of Lollius in the *Troilus*. Where he found the so-called Theban Corinna mentioned, we do not know, any more than we know where he found the name

Since he really believed (as *The House of Fame* shows) that there had once existed a work on Troy by this Lollius, the alleged use of him in the *Troilus* involves the pretence that he had discovered the long-lost document.

What Chaucer was about in ascribing the *Troilus* as a whole to Lollius — the real *ad hoc* of his artistic device — may be further illustrated, on a smaller scale, by a curious passage in the poem itself. In the Fourth Book, when Pandarus is trying to cheer up his disconsolate friend, he cites a certain Zanzis or Zauzis:

And eek, as writ Zanzis, that was ful wys,
 "The newe love out chaceth ofte tholde,"
 And upon newe cas lyth newe avys.
 Thenk eek thyself to saven artow holde.
 Swich fyr by proces shal of kinde colde;
 For syn it is but casuel plesaunce,
 Som cas shal putte it out of remembraunce;

 For al-so seur as day cometh after night,
 The newe loue, labour, or other wo,
 Or elles selde seeing of a wight,
 Don olde affecciouns alle ouer-go;
 And, for thy part, thou shalt have oon of tho
 Tabrigge with thy bittre peynes smerte:
 Absence of hir shal dryue hir out of herte (iv, 414-427).

For all this, the *Filostrato* has merely (iv, 49, 1-4)

E come io udii già sovente dire,
 Il nuovo amor sempre caccia l'antico;
 Nuovo piacere il presente martire
 Torrà da te.

Ballenus and various other pieces of curious lore (see p. 74, below). It is certain enough that the *Anelida* preceded the *Palamon* (see Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, pp. 83-86, where previous studies of Mather and others are cited). Whether the *Troilus* or the *Anelida* was written first, makes little or no difference in our discussion, and the point may be waived. For my own part, I agree with Lowes in the order *Anelida*, *Palamon*, *Troilus* (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XX, 861). At all events, the *Anelida* and the *Troilus* cannot be far apart in date, and the fiction of a lost or hitherto unknown Latin source in the *Anelida* throws a strong light on Chaucer's intention in citing Lollius as his Latin *auctor* in the *Troilus*. I may add that the parallel still holds good if *Corinne* be interpreted as *Corinnus* (Skeat) or as *Ovid* (Shannon, *Publications*, as above, XXVII, 461 ff.), since on either of those two hypotheses the poet would still be pretending to follow for his narrative a lost document which he had discovered.

The saying, though of course Boccaccio does not let Pandaro say so, is from the *Remedia Amoris*, being equally similar to "Successore novo vincitur omnis amor" (462) and to "Et posita est cura cura repulsa nova" (484). Naturally Chaucer recognized it, for the former verse introduces the famous passage about Chryseis and the latter concludes it.¹ His mind, therefore, went back to the *Remedia*, and he expanded Pandarus's speech by adding certain other cures for love that are mentioned by Ovid, — occupation (see *R. A.*, 135-210, especially 139-144, 149-150, 205-206) and absence (*R. A.*, 214-239).² Yet he chose to ascribe "The newe love out-chacheth ofte the olde" to some old sage, Zanzis³ or Zauzis, whom an ancient like Pandarus might be supposed to quote. Here we have a device which, in miniature, is absolutely identical with the ascription of the whole poem to an ancient Latin worthy, one Lollius, an authority on Troy and the Trojans.

¹ *R. A.*, 462-484 (cf. Kittredge, *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, pp. 17 ff.; Wilkins, *Boccaccio Studies*, pp. 54-59).

² In this expansion he follows in part Troilo's words to Pandaro as given by Boccaccio a few stanzas later (iv. 59, overlooked by Rossetti, p. 186, and by Cummings, p. 72):

Credimi Pandar, credimi che amore
Quando s'apprende per sommo piacere
Nell' animo d'alcun, cacciarnel fuore
Non si può mai, ma puonne ben cadere
In processo di tempo, se dolore,
O morte, o povertà, o non vedere
La cosa amata non gli son cagione,
Com' egli avvenne già a più persone.

Swich fyr by proces shal of kynde colde.

For also seur as day cometh after night,
The newe love, labour, or other wo,
Or elles selde seinge of a wight,

Don olde affeciouns alle ouer-go (iv, 418, 421-424).

"Labour," not in Boccaccio, is directly from Ovid.

³ Zanzis is thought to be Zeuxis. One wonders whether Chaucer had happened to hear of the wise and prudent person of that name who figures in the Alexander story. This Zeuxis makes his appearance in the first book of Julius Valerius. The author takes pains to assure us that this is not the famous painter (see *The Physician's Tale*, C 16), but one of Philip's courtiers. He had charge of the young Alexander's expenditures and wrote to inform Philip and Olympias that the prince was wasting his allowance in lavish giving (i, 16, Kuebler, pp. 17-18).

Little did Chaucer imagine, when in the *Troilus* he adopted and improved Boccaccio's fiction of a lost *auctor*, that future generations would pull long faces as they solemnly debated his ingratitude in neglecting to specify his extensive obligations to the Italian poet. When he and Boccaccio first met "in the feld of pitee, out of peyne, that hight Elysos," it is unlikely that Boccaccio thought of reproving him. If, however, Boccaccio was so lacking in humor, and in appreciation of an author's rights, no doubt Chaucer replied by quoting Shakspeare (with the same anachronism by which Shakspeare made Hector quote Aristotle): "The villany you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction."

So far we have proceeded, I think, by a sober and pedestrian method, following known facts step by step. We have resorted to no conjectures, but have candidly interpreted the obvious phenomena (as we purposed to do) in the light of reason and common sense and of the established customs of literary men in past and present. Let us sum up the results in the form of definite propositions.

1. The mere name *Lollius* is not a blunder or an invention; for it is a genuine Roman *nomen gentile*.

2. Chaucer found the name somewhere in the course of his reading, and, of course, it was in some context that he found it, not all alone by itself.

3. The context in which Chaucer found the name was such as to teach him (erroneously) that one Lollius wrote a book on the Trojan War.

4. Accordingly, in *The House of Fame*, Chaucer included Lollius in a list of authorities on the matter of Troy — along with Homer, Dictys, Dares, Guido delle Colonne, and Geoffrey of Monmouth.

5. In thus mentioning Lollius in *The House of Fame* Chaucer was not inventing: he was under a misapprehension. He believed that a work by Lollius on the Trojan War had once existed, but, since neither he nor any of his acquaintances had ever seen it, that it was lost.

6. When Chaucer wrote the *Troilus*, his erroneous belief that one Lollius had written a (lost) work on Troy had not been corrected.

7. Accordingly, in the *Troilus*, as a part of the fiction, Chaucer pretended to be translating faithfully the Latin work of Lollius. This

Lollius is not Boccaccio, nor Petrarch, nor Benoit, nor Guido: he is purely and simply Lollius — a supposed ancient writer on the subject, whose work Chaucer pretended to have before him. The fiction consists not in ascribing to Lollius a work on Troy (for that was merely an error) but in claiming to have this work in hand and to translate it faithfully.

8. Chaucer's fiction of pretending to follow Lollius in the *Troilus* was imitated and improved by him from Boccaccio's similar fiction in the *Teseide* and the *Filostrato*. The improvement consists in ascribing the work to a definitely named source instead of "an ancient history" or "a lost author recently discovered by me in turning over ancient books." In using the name of Lollius, Chaucer was citing an *auctor* in whose existence as a writer on Troy he fully believed, but whose book he thought had disappeared.

9. Chaucer, in accordance with the habits of his time, acknowledged no obligation to mention the actual sources from which he drew the material for his fictions. He felt quite at liberty to invent sources, or to give credit to authors different from those to whom he was actually indebted. In the practice of such devices, for artistic effect, for verisimilitude, or for lending dignity to his subject, he had Boccaccio himself as a distinguished exemplar. There is no moral question involved. The trick justifies itself if it is well worked. If both Chaucer and Boccaccio went farther in this way than a scrupulous modern would feel warranted in going, they had two valid defences, — first, the custom of mediaeval writers, and second, their general avowal of indebtedness to somebody, or, in other words, their disclaimer of originality.

10. Both Gower and Strode must have been aware that Chaucer derived the story of *Troilus* in large part from an Italian poem. The fiction of a reference to Lollius in the *Troilus* was known to some of Chaucer's contemporaries as a fiction, and hence to Lydgate a generation or so later. In other words, it was not a dark secret, carefully locked in the breast of an anxious plagiarist, but a more or less transparent literary device, as to which neither Chaucer nor his associates and followers saw any reason to keep silence in their conversation.

All these theses appear to be irrefutable, and in their light we are now ready to discuss certain interesting questions that have suggested

themselves to the curious minds of us moderns. These questions should be kept sharply distinct, however, from the theses just enumerated; for we are now venturing into the domain of conjecture. Our guesses may be more or less probable, but, right or wrong, they cannot affect the soundness of the most pregnant and unforced propositions already established.

First and foremost, did Chaucer originate the erroneous notion that one Lollius (a real name) wrote a (lost) history of the Trojan War or, at all events, a (lost) book of some kind on the matter of Troy?

A priori one would answer this question in the negative, most decidedly. It is seldom possible to discover the actual originator of anything — especially of a current error. Whatever might have led Chaucer to make this mistake would have been just as likely to lead somebody else to make it before him. The mere fact that Chaucer found the name Lollius, not all alone by itself, but in a context that somehow connected it with Troy, suggests as a distinct probability that some predecessor had similarly discovered it. Finally, the fact that Chaucer's learned friends Gower and Strode allowed his erroneous opinion, published in *The House of Fame*, to pass without challenge, and suffered him to utilize the error, uncorrected, as a part of the fiction in the *Troilus*, a poem dedicated to them and doubtless discussed with them in the process of composition — all this certainly suggests that they shared his error, and, therefore, that this was a matter of common misinformation among the learned in the latter part of the fourteenth century. However, the question whether Chaucer originated the error or merely adopted it, is a matter of no consequence. If one prefers to regard Chaucer as the initial mistaker, no harm can be done. I am far from wishing to exonerate the poet, for he was no *doctor irrefragibilis*. He did make blunders now and then.¹ So do we all. One mistake more or less counts for nothing in his record, or yours, or mine, in a puzzle-headed world.

The objection that we cannot find the statement anywhere before Chaucer should not daunt us until we discover the precise source from which he drew his information about Trophee,² about the Bret Glascurion, about Hermes Ballenus, about Elcanor, about Lymote,³ and

¹ See p. 80, below.

³ *House of Fame*, 1208, 1273, 516, 1274.

² *Monk's Tale*, B 3307 (see p. 60, above).

so on. It makes no difference, logically, whether the information in these cases is correct or incorrect. The point is, that Chaucer derived it from some source that we cannot trace with assurance or cannot trace at all. In other words, he and his contemporaries had (as we sometimes forget) sources of information or misinformation which are either not accessible to us, having perished, or which our antiquaries have not yet unearthed.

Take the case of Hermes Ballenus. Here the reference to Ballenus has been traced to the *Roman de la Rose*,¹ but the French poem does not connect him with Hermes. Yet Chaucer's learning abides the touchstone. He has in mind a certain wise Belinous who found a book of scientific and magical secrets under a statue of Hermes. Where did Chaucer get this information? A question as yet unanswerable. Yet it may be answered any day. The solution may lurk unheeded in the margin of some manuscript of the *Roman*. So in the margin of some other manuscript of something or other was perhaps enshrined a gloss "Lollius maximus scriptor belli Troiani." We have not yet garnered all the sheaves of mediaeval lore, and when the sheaves are garnered, the gleanings will remain, and when all is gleaned, we shall still miss what has perished.

Another instructive example is that of Agathon. This person may have been known to Chaucer as a poet from Dante:

Euripide v'è nosco, ed Antifonte,
Simonide, Agatone ed altri piùe
Greci che già di lauro ornar la fronte;²

or perhaps from Boccaccio's *Amorosa Visione*:

Claudio, Persio, ed Agatone.³

But from neither of these places could he have got the information that led him to associate Agathon with Alcestis and the daisy:

No wonder is that Iove hir stellifye,
As telleth Agaton, for hir goodnesse.⁴

¹ 14601 Méon (Michel, II, 118). See Skeat on *House of Fame*, 1273.

² Purg. xxii, 106-108.

³ v, 50 (MS. note by Child in his copy of Kissner, *Chaucer in seinen Beziehungen zur italienischen Literatur*, p. 9; Koepfel, *Anglia*, XIV, 237).

⁴ *Legend of Good Women*, A 513-514 (B 525-526).

This may have been a chance shot, but one finds it hard to dodge the inference that he somehow knew of Agathon as associated with a flower or flowers; and for this point we are aware of no source that could have helped him except Aristotle's *Poetics*,¹ which he could not read.

We must leave the question undecided, then, whether Chaucer was the initial blunderer in the Lollian business. For convenience, we may speak of the error, in what follows, as Chaucer's, though probability seems to favor the idea that he was adopting some traditional mistake.

Chaucer is not the only fourteenth-century poet who puzzles us in this fashion. For example, I should much like to know where Froissart got his names in the pretty story of Architeles and Orphane,² which he credits to "a wise poet." Orphane, he says, was "serour *Dane*," i.e. "Diana's sister."³ Now *Orphane* seems to be a corruption of *Automate*, who really was the wife of Architeles, and she was a daughter of *Danaus*. But Froissart could not read Pausanias.⁴

It is quite true that we cannot point to a particular place in which Chaucer could have found a citation of "Lollius de Bello Troiano." Still, we can easily exhibit sources from which he might have derived equally remarkable literary lore. We know where he might have found the story, on the authority of "Philosophus ad Maximum," that a committee of eminent Romans, representing various professions, decided that the god of Clemency was to be their chief deity.⁵ We know where he could have found the statement that Seneca "in tragedia quadam" tells how Nero, in a vision, was seen in hell bathing in molten gold and inviting a crowd of lawyers ("venale genus hominum") to join him.⁶

¹ ix, p. 1451b 21 (Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1889, p. 763). Cf. Skeat, III, xxxii-xxxiv.

² *Joli Buisson*, 2102 ff. (Scheler, II, 62 ff.).

³ 2111. Perhaps *Dane* means *Daphne* here, as in Froissart's *Espinette Amoureuse*, 1569 ff. (Scheler, I, 132-138,) and in his *Joli Buisson*, 3156 (II, 94), and in Chaucer; but *Dyane* is mentioned in *Buisson*, 2159, and Chaucer has to warn his readers not to confuse "Penneus doughter" with the goddess (*Knight's Tale*, A 2062-2064).

⁴ vii, 1, 3. Cf. also his story of Narcissus (*Joli Buisson*, 3252 ff., Scheler, II, 96 ff.) with the *ἥσσαν γνῶριμος* tale in Pausanias, ix, 31, 6.

⁵ Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 109, § 24.

⁶ Crane, *Jacques de Vitry*, pp. 14, 148; cf. Ward, *Catalogue*, III, 135, § 136.

And finally — not to multiply examples — we know where he could have found an account of the celebrated interview between Diogenes and Alexander credited to “Saturnus qui illustrium virorum scripsit hystorias.”¹ On the whole, then, it seems rather probable that the error which made Lollius an authority on Troy was not initially Chaucer’s — that he picked up the item somewhere among the miscellanea of the middle ages.

More interesting is the inquiry whether or not the error about Lollius (be it Chaucer’s or *Anon.*’s) sprang from a misunderstanding of a famous passage in Horace — the beginning of the second Epistle of the First Book:

Troiani belli scriptorem, maxime Lolli,
Dum tu declamas Romae, Praeneste relegi.

This theory was long ago proposed by Latham,² and has met with considerable favor, though rejected with contumely in some quarters.

The *a priori* case for Latham’s hypothesis is uncommonly strong. For (1) the initial blunderer did not invent the name Lollius: it is a real name. He found it *somewhere*. (2) He did not invent the idea that Lollius was a writer on the Trojan War. He found that idea, as well as the name, *somewhere*. The chances are, of course, that he found both the name and the notion in the same place and at the same time; and the place must have been an accessible place. Horace’s epistle fulfills all the conditions, and fulfills them brilliantly.³ Reluctance to accept Latham’s idea seems to arise from reluctance to accuse Chaucer, or anybody else, of so considerable a blunder. Still, some one must have blundered somehow sometime, — for without a blunder the belief that a Lollius wrote on the Trojan War could not have been entertained by Chaucer or his contemporaries, — and we shall see presently that to get the Horatian verses wrong was by no means difficult or discreditable.

¹ Ward, III, 119, § 9.

² *Athenaeum*, October 3, 1868, No. 2136, II, 433.

³ Chaucer never mentions Horace by name, though he uses a few bits, doubtless picked up at secondhand. Several lines of this Epistle, however, including the first four verses, are quoted in John of Salisbury’s *Polycraticus*, vii, 9 (ed. Webb, II, 128), as Axon remarked (*Notes and Queries*, 9th Series, III, 224), and other lines occur elsewhere in the same treatise. Chaucer is thought to have known this work of John’s, though the question (I think) is still unsettled. Cf. Lowes, *Modern Language Notes*, XXV, 87–89. If Chaucer was not the initial blunderer, this point is of no consequence.

To accept Latham's conjecture does not carry the obligation to explain precisely how the error came about, — to select, in other words, that one among several possibilities that was actually the process into which the blunderer was betrayed. The more possibilities there were, the greater the chance that we have the right passage before us. Some of these possibilities we may now review, premising that *maxime*, as a mere superlative (not *Maxime* as a part of the name) must underlie all mediaeval ways of interpreting the passage, since the discovery that the *Maximus* was the surname of Horace's young friend is rather modern.

Ten Brink long ago conjectured that the text which caused the error had *scriptorum* for *scriptorem* and *te legi* for *relegi*.¹ Possible, no doubt, but by no means likely! Nor were two corruptions necessary. *Scriptorum* alone would have sufficed, for the passage would then have seemed to mean: "O Lollius, greatest of writers on the Trojan War, while you have been declaiming [your poem] at Rome, I have read it over again at Praeneste." *Scriptor* for *scriptorem* would have had the same result.

So far we have tacitly assumed that *Praeneste* would have been immediately understood by a mediaeval reader as meaning "at Praeneste"; but that is a very large assumption indeed, — particularly when one remembers that Chaucer took *Via Appia* for the name of a town three miles from Rome on the strength of "Vade igitur in tertium miliarium ab urbe via quae Appia nuncupatur":

"Goth forth to Via Appia," quod she,

"That fro the toun ne stant but myles three."²

Proper names are ever and always a pitfall, and in the middle ages no reader, lay or cleric, could hope to keep his foot out of the snare. In estimating, therefore, the chances of misinterpretation, we should not forget the difficulties offered by the second verse. If our friend the initial blunderer had a good mediaeval text of these two lines, what he read was not nicely punctuated and decked out with enlightening capitals. It ran as follows:

Scriptorem belli troiani maxime lolli
dum tu declamas rome prenesti relegi.

¹ Chaucer, *Studien*, 1870, p. 87

² *Second Nun's Tale*, G 172-173.

What was he to make out of *preneste*? Was it *preneste* or *preueste*? The former meant nothing to him, unless he happened to be an uncommonly good geographer. As for *preueste*, what was that? Could it be *pre ueste*? Hardly. An adverb, then? What adverb? And so he gives up *preneste* or *preueste* as a whole. But, since he would be eager to read what he could, and was constrained to let the rest go — as we all do in corrupt or unintelligible passages — he would have grasped at the *te* as presumably a pronoun, — and then he had “O greatest Lollius, I have read *you*, a writer on the Trojan War, over again, while you have been declaiming [your poem] at Rome.”

Or suppose some careless reader or excerptor ran together the heading of the epistle “Ad Lollium” or “Ad Lollium consularem” or “Ad Maximum Lollium” or “Ad Lollium Maximum”¹ with the initial words: — “Ad Lollium maximum scriptorem belli Troiani.” Less than that has often raised strange spirits from the mediaeval deep. That such a trick had in fact got itself played before Chaucer’s time is an ascertained fact, for in one twelfth-century manuscript of Horace the title of the poem is actually “Ad lollium scriptorem.”² This is Burney ms. 178 in the British Museum. The fact that the contents of the Epistle are in large part a compendium of Trojan matters must not be forgotten in weighing the chances that the Lollian error originated somehow from a misreading or misunderstanding of the opening lines.

Even if there were no more to be said, I think Latham’s hypothesis would be pretty well demonstrated as extremely probable, since, as already noted, every additional possibility increases the chance that he hit upon the right passage. Yet one must admit that the conjectures so far considered imply a further error in passing from the second line to what follows, since in verses 3 ff. Horace clearly speaks of the “writer on the Trojan War” *in the third person*. Let us see, therefore, what might have happened to some merely humanly fallible but not abnormally ignorant or careless reader (“even as you or I”) who had a correct text before him, who knew that *Praeneste* means at Pales-trina, and who recognized “scriptorem belli Troiani” as Homer.

Scriptorem belli Troiani, maxime Lolli,
Dum tu declamas Romae, Praeneste relegi.

¹ All these headings occur in manuscripts.

² Hauthal’s Acron, II, 374, note. I have had the heading verified at the Museum.

From this passage our hypothetical reader would have gathered that the Lollius addressed was a person of great importance, — for he could not have known that *Maxime* is a proper name here. Further, as many readers still do, he would inevitably have taken *scriptorem* as the object as well of *declamas* as of *relegi*, and so would have arrived at the opinion that the person addressed was engaged in reciting at Rome some version of Homer — presumably, since he was at Rome, a Latin version, doubtless of his own composition. Thus the passage, though correctly written and in the main correctly translated, would have seemed to him to bear the clear meaning that there once was a Roman, in ancient times, who composed and recited at Rome a Latin poem, of much importance and dignity, founded on Homer, and relating the main events in the Trojan War, with which, be it remembered, a large part of what follows in the Epistle is concerned.

“*Lollius maximus poeta et amicus Horatii Romae declamabat versus de bello Troiano*” would, I think, be a fit summary of such an observation; and nothing more would be wanted to make current the item of misinformation which Chaucer picked up somewhere and utilized for his own purposes. I am not asserting that this is precisely the way in which the Lollian error sprang from the Horatian passage: my point is merely that this in one possible way — and that it required no error in text or enormous blundering in translation. Or suppose some one referred, quite correctly, to “*Horatius ad Lollium de Bello Troiano*.” Such a reference might easily have given rise to “*Lollius de bello Troiano*” — and again the trick is done.

Anything that may have tended to associate the name of Lollius with the Trojan War is pertinent in this inquiry. We may note, therefore, that the Ninth Ode of Horace's Fourth Book is dedicated to a Lollius, whom the middle ages could hardly be expected to distinguish sharply from him of the Epistle, and that much of the ode, like much of the Epistle, is devoted to Homer and the matter of Troy. It is humbly submitted that if a mediaeval scholar read this ode and the Epistle, and inferred therefrom that Lollius wrote something on Troy, the error was not so surprising as that of Speght when he dug out Lollius Urbicus from the Augustan History, turned him into a Lollius of Urbino, and — though he was expressly declared to have

written a history "sui temporis" — cheerfully equated him with the alleged source of Chaucer's *Troilus*.¹

Again, suppose the following scholium of the pseudo-Acron on the ode got separated from the text:

Ad Marcum Lollium scribit consularem adfirmans immortalia futura scripta sua, quamuis ante eum sint alii meliores poetae; nam nec Homeri magnitudinem obstare quominus Pindarus et alii poetae, qui post eum orti sunt, clari essent.²

A careless reader might easily have taken *sua* to refer to Lollius, not *Horace*,³ and so Lollius' reputation as a poet of importance, though inferior to Homer, might have become a current fact of mediaeval information. The mention of Homer would have been enough to prompt the further inference that Lollius too had busied himself with the tale of Troy. The name of Pindar would have helped rather than hindered, for, as we know, "Pindarus" passed in the middle ages as a Latin poet who had translated Homer — as the author, in short, of the extant *Ilias Latina*.⁴

Until some positive evidence turns up, I think we may take it as pretty well established that the Epistle of Horace, assisted perhaps by the ode or the scholium or by both, is the authority for the mediaeval notion that one Lollius was a writer of importance on the Trojan War.

In order to test the reasonableness of the opinion that Chaucer or some predecessor was capable of misunderstanding Horace's lines in the manner suggested by Latham, we could cite other errors of the poet's, fit to range with that already quoted about the Appian Way.⁵ "Partriches winges" on Fame's feet, from Virgil's "pedibus celerem et pernicipibus alis," will serve for one.⁶ The error about Plato (for Solomon) and "his book Senior;"⁷ Brutus and Cassius run together

¹ See p. 83, below.

² Ed. Hauthal, I, 412 (cf. 415); ed. Keller, I, 355.

³ The heading of the ode — "Ad Lollium de immortalitate carminum suorum" — may have helped to mislead.

⁴ See, for summary information, Bährens, *Poetae Latini Minores*, III (1881), 4-5. I do not see why the attachment of Pindar's name to this text in the middle ages may not have come from a misunderstanding of this same gloss.

⁵ P. 77, above.

⁶ *House of Fame*, 1391-1392.

⁷ *Canon's Yeoman's Tale*, G 1448 ff.

into one name, so that "Brutus Cassius" becomes the ringleader in the conspiracy against Caesar,¹ and, *per contra*, Ascanius and Iulus made into two distinct persons;² Busiris confused with Diomedes of Thrace;³ Titan identified with Tithonus;⁴ Corus (or Thorus) as a seagod;⁵ Marcia (Marsyas) losing *her* skin;⁶ "Persi regis" translated by "the king of Perciens"⁷ — these and many other venial sins, familiar to every student, may suffice to assure us that Chaucer was not superior to human frailty.⁸

And we all know that even professional scholars in the middle ages were quite unable, from the circumstances in which they worked, to avoid what seem to us astounding blunders. Examples are hardly called for, but one set may be entertaining. Walter Burley, who died about the time of Chaucer's birth, was a man of real learning who enjoyed the title of "doctor planus et perspicuus." He taught philosophy at Oxford, and is said to have been for a time the tutor of Edward III,

¹ *Monk's Tale*, B 3887 ff.

² *House of Fame*, 177-178. This may be real learning, however (see Roscher, s. v. *Iulus*).

³ *Monk's Tale*, B 3293-3294. See Shannon, *Modern Philology*, XI, 227-229.

⁴ *Troilus*, iii, 1464-1470 (see p. 116, below).

⁵ *Legend of Good Women*, 2422.

⁶ *House of Fame*, 1229 ff. Chaucer never could have understood Dante's cryptic utterance "quando Marsia traesti Della vagina delle membra sue" (*Par.*, i, 20-21) unless he had known the story, and Ovid (*Met.*, vi, 383 [*satyri*], 384 [*quem*], and 392 [*illum*]) makes the gender clear. Cf. *Teseide*, xi, 62: "Nel quale si vedefa Marsia sonando, Sè con Apollo nel sonar provando."

⁷ *Boethius*, bk. ii, prose 2, l. 47 (Skeat).

⁸ As illustrations of the errors which a poet might make in the fourteenth century, even in treating of commonplace matters, the following examples would be enlightening, if light were really needed. Froissart makes it Proserpine for whom Orpheus went to Hades: she could not return with him because she had eaten (*Joli Buisson*, 3164-3191, Scheler, II, 94-95). In *Le Trésor Amoureux*, wrongly ascribed to Froissart, Adonis is the son of Venus and pursues Atalanta (1719 ff., Scheler, III, 190 ff.). Froissart's Enclimpostair, son of Morpheus (*Paradys d'Amour*, 28, Scheler, I, 2), has become famous through Chaucer's adoption (*Book of the Duchess*, 167; cf. *Englische Studien*, XXVI, 321 ff.). In *L'Orloge Amoureux* Tubulus (apparently Tibullus) is said to have died for love: "Ce fu pour lui une honnorable fin" (1120-1130, Scheler, I, 85). In the *Joli Buisson* Narcissus dies for love of Echo, whose face he thinks he sees in the fountain (3252 ff., Scheler, II, 96 ff.), and Cepheus is killed by falling from a tree which he had climbed to see if Hero was coming (3216 ff., II, 95-96).

and later of the Black Prince. He certainly enjoyed the royal favor. One of his most popular books — probably compiled as a university manual — was the *Liber de Vita et Moribus Philosophorum Poetarum-que Veterum*. Dr. Knust, who has edited this work, gives an amusing list of some of the curious mistakes that it contains. Burley confuses Epaminondas with Epimenides, Isocrates with Socrates, Xenophanes with Xenophon, Agesilaus with Arcesilaus, Africanus major with Africanus minor, Cato of the *Distichs* and Cato the Censor with Cato Uticensis, Publius (i.e. Publilius) Syrus with Publius Terentius, Pliny the Elder with Pliny the Younger.¹ In his chapter on Horace, he tells how “Oracius Flaccus poeta illustris,” when he was *pontifex maximus* and was dedicating a temple to Jupiter, received the news of his son’s death, but did not allow it to disturb him in the sacred ceremony — an anecdote which should stand to the credit of Horatius Pulvillus.² Titus Livius appears in Burley’s pages as “historiographus et tragediarum scriptor,” by confusion, of course, with Livius Andronicus.³

We can come nearer home, however. Somebody in the middle ages blundered about Lollius somehow: that is beyond dispute. Is it incredible that the blunder should have come from the Horatian passage? Let us test the question again — this time by reviewing some of the mistakes that modern scholars have made in discussing the Lollian problem itself.

In the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* two distinct persons named Lollius Urbicus are mentioned, — one a magistrate and general of the second century of our era,⁴ the other an historian of the third.⁵

The first of these was a man of mark in his day, and we have a good deal of documentary evidence about him.⁶ He was legatus in Britain in the reign of Antonius Pius;⁷ he is mentioned by Fronto⁸ and Apuleius⁹ as a contemporary; and there are at least six inscriptions

¹ *Gualteri Burlaei Liber de Vita et Moribus Philosophorum*, pp. 400-401.

² Cap. 110, ed. Knust, p. 350.

³ Cap. 88, p. 310.

⁴ *Antoninus Pius*, 5.

⁵ *Antoninus Diadumenus*, 9.

⁶ Von Rohden and Dessau, *Prosopographia*, II, 297.

⁷ “[Antoninus] per legatos suos plurima bella gessit, nam et Brittanos per Lollium Urbicum vicit legatum alio muro caespiticio summotis barbaris ducto,” etc. (*Ant. Pius*, 5).

⁸ *Ad Amicos*, ii, 7.

⁹ *De Magia*, 2.

that concern him, — two Roman,¹ two British,² and two African.³ One of these, which relates to the *vallum* of Antoninus (Graham's Dyke), has long been familiar to archaeologists, and was discussed by the admirable Horseley in 1732.⁴

The second Lollius Urbicus is known only from a single passage in the *Life of Diadumenus* ascribed to Lampridius, which, however, suffices to prove that he lived in the reigns of Macrinus and Heliogabalus, and that he wrote a "history of his own time."⁵ This personage was introduced into English literary history, as Chaucer's Lollius, by Speght, who, in the Folio of 1598, included him in the list of authors appended to his Glossary as "*Lollius*, an Italian Historiographer, borne in the citie of Urbine."⁶ *Urbicus*, to be sure, is a derivative of *urbs*, and is not a synonym for *Urbinas*, "of Urbino," but that made no difference: Speght's error became current. Dr. Timothy Thomas, in 1721, added some learned material to Speght's note, and, having consulted the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, included Lollius in the list of authors appended to the Glossary to Urry's Chaucer as "an Italian Historiographer born at *Urbino*, who lived under the Emperors *Macrinus* and *Heliogabalus*, in the beginning of the Third Century," remarking that he "is said to have written the History of his own Time, and also the Life of the Emperor *Diadumenus* the Son of *Macrinus*."⁷ This note not only repeats Speght's mis-translation of *Urbicus* (as if it were *Urbinas*), but involves a wrong inference from the words of Lampridius. Lollius Urbicus *did* write a "History of his Own Time," which Lampridius cites for certain details about Diadumenus, but there is no foundation for the statement that he *also* wrote a biography of that boy-emperor; whatever he had to

¹ *C.I.L.* VI, i, 6 (No. 28); VI, ii, 1410 (No. 10707).

² Hübner, *C.I.L.*, VII, 180, 201, Nos. 1041, 1125.

³ Wilmanns, *C.I.L.*, VIII, i, 607, Nos. 6705, 6706.

⁴ *Britannia Romana*, pp. 197-198 (cf. pp. 50, 51). This is Hübner's No. 1125.

⁵ The author of the *Life* cites Lollius Urbicus for details about the murder of Diadumenus given "in historia sui temporis." This murder took place A.D. 218.

⁶ Sig. Bbbb. ii, v^o (ed. 1602, sig. Uuu, iii, leaf 4, v^o; ed. 1687, sig. Ssss, v^o).

⁷ *A short Account of some of the Authors cited by Chaucer*, appended to the Glossary in Urry's Chaucer, 1721, p. 80. Perhaps Dr. Thomas went, not to the *Scriptores*, but to Gerard Vossius, *De Historicis Latinis*, bk. ii, ch. 2 (2d ed., 1651, p. 176), whose account of Lollius, however, is accurate.

say on the subject was obviously contained in this same *Historia sui Temporis*.

Warton, in 1774, remarked that Chaucer's *Troilus* "is said to be formed on an old history, written by Lollius, a native of Urbino."¹ But it does not appear that he accepted *Urbicus* and *Urbinas* as synonymous. At all events, he expressly states that "Lollius Urbicus," the historian of the third century, "could not be Chaucer's Lollius."² He makes an odd mistake, however, when he says: "It is extraordinary, that Du Fresne, in the *Index Auctorum*, used by him for his Latin glossary, should mention this Lollius Urbicus of the third century," none of whose works, as Warton "apprehends," remain.² It would indeed be extraordinary if Du Cange had pretended to use this lost author. The truth is, he does nothing of the kind. His *Index Auctorum*, as he states expressly, is meant to include all the writers "inferioris Latinitatis" that he knew of, both those whom he used in his *Glossarium* and those whom he did not;³ and the way in which he mentions Lollius Urbicus⁴ makes it quite clear that he had no knowledge of that historian except what was afforded by the passage of Lampridius already mentioned.⁵ Another strange remark of Warton's is the assertion that "Boccac[c]io himself, in the *DECAMERON*, mentions the story of Troilus and Cressida in Greek verse";⁶ which, adds Warton, "I suppose had been translated by some of the fugitive Greeks with whom he was connected, from a romance on that subject." I venture to suggest that this remark is quite as extraordinary—all circumstances considered—as Chaucer's erroneous registration of Lollius as an historian of the Trojan War.

¹ *History of English Poetry*, 1774, § 14, I, 384.

² *Ibid.*, note a.

³ "Caeteros illaudatos inferioris Latinitatis Scriptoribus laudatis adjungendos" (*Glossarium*, ed. 1681, cols. 78-79).

⁴ "Lollius Urbicus, Historicus, vix. sub Macrino and Heliogabalo. Vide Vossium" (col. 129). Gerard Vossius, *De Historicis Latinis*, ii, 2 (2d ed., 1651, p. 176), refers to Lampridius as our only source of knowledge on this writer.

⁵ It is only fair to say that Warton contributes some really valuable information about the *Troilus* material.

⁶ I, 351 (cf. 384). See *Decameron*, 6th day, introduction: "E Dioneo insieme con Lauretta di Trojolo e di Criseida cominciarono a cantare." That is all. Cf. Warton's *Emendations and Additions* to Vol. I, p. 385 (in Vol. II); Wilkins, *Boccaccio Studies*, p. 52.

From Speght's and Dr. Thomas's assertion and Warton's hesitating remarks, the supposed Lollius of Urbino (who owes his existence solely to Speght's misunderstanding of the adjective *Urbicus*), became almost inseparably attached to Chaucer. The eminent Heyne, the philological dictator of Germany in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, actually translated the name "Lollius of Urbino" into Latin, oblivious of the fact that it was a mere blunder, and asserted, in his famous edition of Virgil, that Chaucer derived his *Troilus* from "Lollius Urbinas et Guido de Colonna."¹

Joly, in referring to this error of Heyne's, makes a mistake of his own, for he says: — "Il est, par ce passage même, évident que Heyne ne parle de Lollius que sur l'autorité de Chaucer."² Certainly Heyne did not derive his *Urbinas* from Chaucer, who does not associate Lollius with that city or with any city — except Troy! One suspects that Joly took *Urbicus* as a synonym of *Urbinas* anyhow, for, in connection with his quotation from Heyne, he remarks that Schoell mentions the non-existent "Lollius d'Urbain" as a real author. Now the fact is that Schoell knows nothing of any Lollius of Urbino. His entry concerns only the historian Lollius Urbicus and is perfectly sober and accurate: "Lollius Urbicus, auteur d'un histoire de son temps, c'est-à-dire de celui de Macrin et d'Elagabalus."³

A recent Romance scholar of repute, Marcus Landau, in an attempt to correct some of the old errors, has embroiled the whole subject afresh. According to Landau, "Dryden confused [Chaucer's] Lollius with Lollius Urbicus, the author of a lost work on the Emperor Severus, and made out of him a Lollius of Urbino, who according to him, was Chaucer's and Shakspeare's source."⁴ Now what Dryden wrote in the

¹ "Observabimus tandem recentiorum quoque fabularum factum esse Troilum argumentum, Lollii quidem Vrbinatis et Guidonis de Colonna. Vnde Chaucer duxit suum Troilum et Cressida" (Excursus xvii on *Aeneid* i). This passage does not occur in the first edition (1771, II, 127-128) or the second (1787, II, 160-161), but makes its first appearance in the third (Leipzig, 1800, II, 212; 1803, II, 178). It is also found in the fourth edition (Wagner's), 1832, II, 250, and in Lemaire's edition, 1819, II, 203. The London "third edition" (1793), II, 155-156 does not contain it.

² *Benott de Sainte-More*, I, 217, note 1.

³ *Histoire abrégée de la littérature romaine*, Paris, 1815, III, 146.

⁴ "Chaucer also, der ebenfalls ein Epos von Troilus und Cressida geschrieben, gibt es für die Uebersetzung des lateinischen Werks eines gewissen Lollius aus.

preface to his own *Troilus and Cressida* (1679), is bad enough, but it does not accord with Landau's account. "The Original story," says Dryden, "was Written by one *Lollius*, a *Lombard*, in Latin verse, and Translated by *Chaucer* into English: intended I suppose a Satyr on the Inconstancy of Women: I find nothing of it among the Ancients; not so much as the name once *Cressida* mention'd. Shakspear, . . . in the Apprenticeship of his Writing, model'd it into that Play, which is now call'd by the name of *Troilus and Cressida*." Certainly it cannot be alleged that Dryden made a Lollius of Urbino out of Lollius Urbicus. He says not a word about Lollius *Urbicus*, and does not mention Urbino, but declares that Chaucer's Lollius was a Lombard — and Urbino (as I suppose Landau knew) is not in Lombardy. Dryden's information might all have been derived from Chaucer's *Troilus* itself except the statement that Lollius was a Lombard. This he doubtless inferred from Speght's *Life of Geffrey Chaucer* in the folio of 1598, where we read: "Troilus and Creseid called *Throphe* in the Lumbard tongue, translated: not *verbatim*, but the Argument thence taken, and most cunningly amplified by Chaucer."¹ Speght's language, indeed, is echoed by Dryden in the Preface to his *Fables* (1700), when he remarks that "*Troilus and Cressida* was written by a *Lombard* Author; but much amplified by our *English* Translatour, as well as beautified."² In the folio Chaucer of 1602 Speght's note appears in the following form: "Troilus and Creseid called *Throphe* in the Lumbard tongue, was translated out of Latin, as in the preface to the second booke of Troilus and Creseid he confesseth in these wordes:

"To every louer I me excuse,
That of no sentiment I this endite,
But out of Latin in my tonge it write."³

Miss Hammond⁴ also seriously mistakes Dryden. She writes: "Dryden, in the preface to his '*Troilus and Cressida*,' said that 'the

Diesen sonst unbekannten Lollius verwechselte Dryden mit Lollius Urbicus, dem Verfasser eines verloren gegangenen Werks über Kaiser Severus und machte aus ihm einen Lollius aus Urbino, der Chaucers und Shakespeare's Quelle gewesen sein sollte" (Landau, *Giovanni Boccaccio*, 1877, pp. 91-92).

¹ Sig. c, i, r^o.

² Sig. B.

³ Sig. c. j. v^o (so also in the folio of 1687, sig. b v^o).

⁴ *Chaucer, a Bibliographical Manual*, 1908, p. 95. I take occasion once more to express my sense of the high value of this indispensable book.

original story was written by one Lollius, in Lombard verse," whereas Dryden says distinctly, "by one Lollius, a Lombard, in Latin verse." "This he derived, it is probable," she adds," from the note in Speght's glossary — 'Lollius, an Italian Historiographer borne in the cite of Urbine.'" As to this we note (1) that this remark is not in Speght's Glossary, but in the list of authors appended to his glossary, and (2) that Speght's note does not say that Lollius wrote in Lombard verse; — does not, indeed, mention Lombardy at all.

Miss Hammond also makes several mistakes in her account of Lollius Urbicus the historian cited in the *Life of Diadumenus* in the so-called Augustan History. In the first place, she says that this life was "written about 400 A.D." But soon after she remarks that the Augustan History "was written during the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine," that is, A.D. 284-337. Perhaps, then, 400 is a misprint for 300. Further, she remarks that, "as the Augustan History was written during the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, Lollius has been considered as of the third century." This, however, is *not* the reason for so dating him. The reason is that the language of the *Life of Diadumenus* (no matter when the Augustan History was written) implies beyond the possibility of misapprehension that this Lollius was living at the time of the murder of Diadumenus, which took place in 218.

But this is not all. Professor Lounsbury, in giving an account of the Lollius legend, makes a mistake of his own. He says that the Lollius Urbicus who is mentioned by Capitolinus as conquering the Britons in the reign of Antoninus Pius and the Lollius Urbicus who is cited by Lampridius as having written a history of his own times, are "presumably the same man," ignoring the fact that they lived in different centuries, and adds that "nothing has ever been heard of him or it beyond these two brief references."¹ Yet, as we have seen, much has been heard of the elder Lollius Urbicus besides the reference to him in the so-called Capitolinus. Further, Lounsbury appears to accept "of Urbino" as a good translation of the adjective *Urbicus*. It would be hard to find a more striking example of the way in which bits of information and misinformation combined get adrift in the learned world.

¹ *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 405-406.

The supposition that Chaucer blundered in reading Horace "involves," says Lounsbury, "the . . . assumption that a man who was sufficiently familiar with Latin to translate with reasonable accuracy a philosophical work, written in that tongue, was capable of confusing in an easy sentence forms so widely distinct as those of the genitive and the vocative case."¹ This statement involves a curious oversight. If Chaucer identified *Lolli* in Horace's line with *scriptorem*, what he confused was certainly not the genitive and the vocative, — and anyhow, the genitive and the vocative of *Lollius* are not "widely distinct" forms. Hamilton makes a different mistake about cases when he defines Lounsbury's "main premise" as the proposition that Chaucer "would not have made the slip of mistaking a genitive for an ablative."² No ablative or genitive is involved in the question.

May we not argue that these errors of Lounsbury and Hamilton are quite as unlikely to have been committed by those scholars as the error suggested by Latham was unlikely to have been committed by Chaucer or some forerunner?

Even Dr. Latham's note, which is printed a plain type in a modern journal,³ has been more than once unintentionally misrepresented, as if he thought Chaucer were the initial blunderer. What he suggests, on the contrary, is clearly that the mistake had been previously made by somebody unknown, and that "by the time of Chaucer" *Lollius* had come to be regarded, on the basis of that blunder, as a writer on the Trojan War.⁴ It is rather odd that Rossetti himself, in 1873, appears to make this mistake with regard to Latham,⁵ though Latham's letter to the *Athenaeum* was written in reply to a theory of Rossetti's published in the immediately preceding number of this journal,⁶ and

¹ *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 409-410.

² *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde to Guido delle Colonne's Historia Trojana*, p. 40, note.

³ *Athenaeum*, No. 2136, Oct. 3, 1868, II, 433.

⁴ "My own view, and that I believe of others, is . . . that by the time of Chaucer the name of the person there addressed had become attached to the person written about."

⁵ "It appears to me that the most reasonable . . . suggestion is that made . . . by Dr. R. G. Latham — that Chaucer has, by some blunder or confusion, got the name *Lollius* out of Horace's line" (*Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde compared with Boccaccio's Filostrato*, 1873, p. vii).

⁶ *Athenaeum*, No. 2135, Sept. 26, 1868.

though Rossetti followed Latham in the very next number¹ with a communication accepting the doctor's theory and abandoning his own. Miss Hammond is under the same misapprehension.² She adds the remark: "Note that already Bradshaw (see Prothero's Memoir, p. 216) had made the same suggestion as did Latham." But the passage in Prothero records no such suggestion.

We may conclude with a blunder by another distinguished scholar, pertinent here, because its perpetrator is accepting Latham's conjecture. "La invenzione del nome *Lollo Urbico* fu suggerita al Chaucer probabilmente," writes Hortis, "dall' ode oraziana: Trojani belli scriptorem maxime Lolli etc."³ As to this there are four observations to make: — (1) Chaucer does not speak of Lollius *Urbicus*; (2) if he did, he would not be inventing the name, for it is a real name, borne by at least two historical personages; (3) Lollius *Urbicus* could not be invented by anybody on the basis of the Horatian line; (4) Horace's epistle is not an ode.

I have not undertaken to catalogue the errors of scholars with regard to the *Troilus* and its sources, but simply to select, from the mass of familiar material,⁴ a number of mistakes about Lollius — not mere instances of poor judgment, or of wild theorizing on moot points, but plain honest homespun errors about matters of fact. The point is, of course, that these blunders have been made — *and made about Lollius* — not by persons who, in the days of manuscripts, were casually acquiring miscellaneous information, or groping about in their memories for things once seen but now beyond the scope of verification, but by modern specialists engaged in studying the Lollian problem with printed texts and printed books of reference at their elbows.

My brief review has been undertaken in a spirit of humility, not of censoriousness. Indeed, the very name of Lollius seems to have acted as a spell. A deceptive glamour attends it. Hardly anybody has approached the charmed circle without losing his way and wandering about, pixy-led, mistaking bushes for bears. I can claim no exemption

¹ No. 2137, Oct. 10, 1868, II, 465.

² P. 96.

³ *Studj sulle Opere Latine del Boccaccio*, p. 581, note 1.

⁴ See the summaries of Hamilton (*The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Troilus and Creseide to Guido delle Colonne's Historia Trojana*, 1903, pp. 1-50) and Miss Hammond (*Chaucer: a Bibliographical Manual*, 1908, pp. 94 ff., etc.).

from the ban, and feel little doubt that I have blundered somewhere. Several bad mistakes, indeed, I have already cut out of my manuscript. Others, I trust, remain to help in establishing the proposition that I am endeavoring to prove — to wit, the proposition that a mediaeval error in dealing with the Horatian passage is very probable.

A hitherto unnoted source from which, by easy processes of error and confusion — such as were inevitable in the middle ages — the name of Lollius Maximus may have got abroad as that of an authority on ancient history (or the name of Lollius as that of a *very great* authority on the same), is the account given of Damophilus in Suidas' lexicon. Among the works of this "philosopher and sophist" are mentioned, Φιλόβιβλος, πρῶτος περὶ ἀξιοκλήτων βιβλίων, πρὸς Δόλλιον Μάξιμον, Περί βίου ἀρχαίων· καὶ ἕτερα πάμπολλα.¹ From this it appears that Damophilus was credited (1) with a work entitled Φιλόβιβλος addressed or dedicated to Lollius Maximus, and (2) with another work "On the Life of the Ancients." Now it would not have been a matter of much difficulty for the words Δόλλιον Μάξιμον περὶ βίου ἀρχαίων to get shuffled together in somebody's mind, with the result that Lollius came to be regarded as a writer on the life of the ancients, or even as a biographer of the men of old.² This is suggested merely as something possible enough. Damophilus, the Bithynian, is cited as a curious antiquary by Julian,³ and there may have been accounts of him in Latin as well as in Greek.

In conclusion, let us not forget that there was once a Lollius who did treat of the Trojan War at least twice, though in the briefest fashion. This was Lollius Bassus, of the first century of our era. His epigrams on this subject are worth quoting. The first is a compliment to Rome:

¹ Suidas, s. v. Δαμόφιλος, I, 1169-1170, Bernhardy.

² A part of this error has certainly been perpetrated by Philip Smith. In Smith's Dictionary, I, 937, he speaks of this work of Damophilus as "On the Lives of the Ancients (περὶ βίων ἀρχαίων)."

³ *Misopogon*, p. 358 C. Suidas says of Damophilus, δὲ ἀνεθρέψατο Ἰουλιανός. This is thought to be P. Salvius Julianus, consul A. D. 175 (von Rohden and Des-sau, *Prosopographia*, III, 166). Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa says that "Damophilus . . . war nach Suidas Pflegesohn des M. Salvius Iulianus" — a remark in which he certainly goes beyond his text. But nobody can touch Lollius, even secondarily, without suffering for it.

* Ἀρρηκτοὶ Μοιρῶν πυμάτην ἐσφράγισαν ὄρκοι
τῷ Φρυγὶ παρ βωμῷ τὴν Πριάμου θυσίην.
Ἄλλὰ σοί, Αἰνεία, στόλος ἱερὸς Ἴταλὸν ἤδη
ὄρμον ἔχει, πάτρης φροῖμιον οὐρανίης.
Ἐς καλὸν ὤλετο πύργος ὁ Τρώϊος· ἡ γὰρ ἐν ὅπλοις
ἡγήρθη κόσμος παντὸς ἄνασσα πόλις.¹

The second might almost be called a warning against the hidden rocks and reefs of the Lollian controversy:

Οὐλόμεναι νήεσσι Καφηρίδες, αἶ ποτε νόστον
ώλεσασθ' Ἑλλήνων καὶ στόλον Ἰλιόθεν,
πυρσὸς ὅτε ψεύστας χθονίης δνοφερώτερα νυκτὸς
ἦψε σέλα, τυφλὴ δ' ἔδραμε πᾶσα τρόπις
χοιράδας ἐς πέτρας, Δαναοῖς πάλιν Ἴλιος ἄλλη
ἔπλετο, καὶ δεκέτους ἐχθροτέρη πολέμου.
Καὶ τὴν μὲν τότε ἔπερσαν· ἀνίκητος δὲ Καφηρεὺς,
Ναύπλιε· σοὶ γὰρ πᾶν Ἑλλάς ἐκλαυσε δάκρυ.²

Let nobody accuse me of maintaining that Chaucer's *Lollius* has anything to do with Lollius Bassus — or that Chaucer was a student of the *Anthology* — or even that the pretty epigram of Agathias on the swallows³ is the source of certain stanzas of similar tenor in the *Troilus*.⁴ Yet, after all, such theories on my part would but add one more to the long list of shipwrecks on this fatal cliff!

¹ *Anth. Pal.*, ix, 236 (Dübner, II, 46-47).

³ v, 237.

² *Anth. Pal.*, ix, 289 (Dübner, II, 58).

⁴ ii, 57-70.

APPENDIX I

ON CHAUCER'S REFERENCES TO HIS SOURCES IN THE TROILUS

In the early part of my paper I made the following postulate: "Chaucer takes quite particular pains to convey the impression that his *Troilus*, from beginning to end, is a faithful translation from the Latin work of Lollius, without any material additions either from other sources or from his own pen" (p. 54); and I promised to prove this proposition in an appendix. I regret the necessity, but am not to blame for it. The case is as clear as Chaucer could make it, but can only be established by going through the poem in the order in which it is written; for the evidence is cumulative, and the effect of any single mention of Lollius or "myn auctor," or of any single allusion to him, may extend far beyond the immediate context.

The following table gives a list of all the references or allusions to a source, along with four or five passages that have no significance but are included for the sake of completeness.

i, 132-133.	iii, 1576.
i, 141-147.	iii, 1774-1775.
i, 159-161.	iii, 1811-iv, 21 (iii, 1817; iv, 18-21).
i, 393-399 (394).	iv, 36-42.
i, 492-497 (495).	iv, 799-805.
ii, 8-49 (13-14, 18, 49).	iv, 1415-1421.
ii, 100-108.	v, 15-21 (19).
ii, 699-700.	v, 799-840 (799, 804, 816, 834).
ii, 1219-1220.	v, 848.
ii, 1564-1568.	v, 946.
ii, 1595-1596.	v, 1009.
ii, 1700-1701.	v, 1032.
iii, 39-49 (cf. ii, 13-14 with iii, 43-44).	v, 1037-1085 (1037, 1044, 1050, 1051).
iii, 90-91.	v, 1086-1099.
iii, 442-455.	v, 1459.
iii, 470.	v, 1478-1484.
iii, 491-504 (502-503)	v, 1562-1565.
iii, 575-581.	v, 1646-1666 (1651, 1653).
iii, 967-973.	v, 1751-1771 (1753, 1758).
iii, 1193-1199 (1196, 1199).	v, 1776.
iii, 1321-1330.	v, 1803-1804.
iii, 1369-1372.	v, 1854-1855.
iii, 1429.	

"Myn auctor" is certainly "Lollius." On that point no doubt is possible nor does there seem to be any disposition to deny so plain a proposition. Whatever may be said of vaguer attributions (like "as I rede" or "writen as I fynde" or "olde bokes"), Lollius and *myn auctor* are always one and the same person in Chaucer's poem.

"Myn auctor, called Lollius" is first cited in i, 394, and the detail credited to him is certainly to be found in the *Filostrato*¹ — namely, the general purport of Troilus' song in contradistinction to the *ip-sissima verba*, which Chaucer pretends to substitute. We note that this passage not only registers Lollius distinctly and definitely as the source of the *Troilus*, but also tends to create the expectation that whenever Chaucer departs from that source, he will give notice, as here, particularly in case he inserts anything. This impression is strengthened as the poem goes on, and therefore the point need not now be pressed. It is enough for the present to recognize that Chaucer here sets up Lollius as his *auctor* and leaves upon our minds the general impression that he purposes to follow him with conscientious fidelity.

But, though this is the first mention of Lollius in the poem, it is not the first place where a particular source is indicated; for when Chaucer refers to "reading," as he does in i, 133 and 159, he is in effect referring to his *auctor*, whose name is soon to be given (in 394). These two passages should not be neglected, and with them must be considered certain intervening lines (141-147) that distinguish the *auctor* Chaucer means to follow (as yet unnamed) from those widely known writers on general Trojan history — Homer and Dictys and Dares. Even before he names Lollius, then, Chaucer has led us to believe that in narrating "the double sorrow of Troilus" he is following a particular *auctor*, and he has revealed to us the contents of that *auctor's* work in two particulars:

- (1) But whether that she children hadde or noon,
I rede it nought; therfore I lete it goon (i, 132-133).
- (2) In sondry wises shewed, *as I rede*,
The folk of Troye hir observaunces olde,
Palladiones feste for to holde (i, 159-161).

¹ i, 37: "E quindi lieto si diede a cantare." See Young, pp. 191-192 (and references); Wise, p. 5; Cummings, pp. 158-159.

Now the second of these references is true to the *Filostrato*,¹ but the first is notoriously the opposite, for Boccaccio expressly declares that Cressida had no children.² The next mention of "reading" comes soon after the mention of Lollius, namely, in 495, and this time the reference is again true to the *Filostrato*.³ For the first 500 lines of his poem, then, three of Chaucer's references to his source will suit the formula *Lollius* = *Boccaccio*,⁴ and one will not.⁵ For the rest of the book we are left without any further indication — the inference being that Lollius is followed. Yet there are hundreds of verses that do not come from Boccaccio. The significance of all this is plain enough, but it becomes still plainer when we reach Book ii.

Here, in vv. 8-49 of the proem, "myn auctor" appears in great state. Chaucer declares that if Clio will only help him to make good rhymes, nothing more will be necessary in this book,⁶ since he is not composing anything original but simply translating from Latin into English. Therefore, he adds, he wishes neither praise nor blame for "all this work," — "for as myn auctor seyde, so seye I." And he closes with the words —

Sin I have bigonne
Myn auctor shal I folwen, if I conne.

There is no mistaking the impression that Chaucer wished these lines to convey. They are equivalent to saying that so far he has followed Lollius in a faithful translation (though not, of course, in a literal translation because he is turning that author's Latin into English rhyme), and that he intends to continue in the same way. Yet of the 500 lines immediately preceding, more than 300 are Chaucer's own, and immediately after this express statement, we have more than 200 verses of which hardly a word can be found in the *Filostrato*. These are ii, 50-273, and what is true of them, is true likewise of ii, 323-385, 421-500, 526-553, 603-644, and 666-698. In short, despite the elaborate professions of fidelity to his *auctor*, it appears that about 500

¹ i, 18.

² i, 15.

³ i, 48. Chaucer substitutes "wel rede I" for Boccaccio's "è assai chiaro ed aperto."

⁴ *Troilus*, i, 159-161, 394-395, 495.

⁵ i, 132-133.

⁶ "This book" (10) appears to mean, not the whole poem, but Book ii. At the beginning of Book iii Chaucer invokes Venus and Calliope.

out of the 650 verses that come immediately after the proem are not from Boccaccio. "Myn auctor," then, as there used for an extensive look before and after, is strikingly inconsistent with the equation *Boccaccio = Lollius*.

But we have not done. Chaucer now appeals once more to his *auctor*, this time in introducing an account of Cressida's meditations:

And what she thoughte, somewhat shal I wryte,
As to myn auctor listeth for to endyte (ii, 699-700).

The meditations, which take up vv. 701-812, contain much more of Chaucer than of Boccaccio; and they are immediately followed by the garden scene (ii, 813-910), which is original with Chaucer,¹ though the reader could hardly avoid the inference that it too came from Lollius.

The next appeal to a source is in ii, 1219-1220,² where Chaucer says that "his intent" is to give "the effect" of Cressida's letter "as far as he can understand." And, in truth, he here condenses the seven-stanza Italian epistle³ into five lines. Immediately after, however, before the impression of this reference to authority has faded from our minds, Chaucer becomes notably original, departing from Boccaccio at v. 1227 and (except for some 50 lines) remaining original for about 500 verses — to the end of the second book. Yet in this long passage of original matter he twice pretends to be condensing his *auctor*:

But flee we now prolixitee best is,
For loue of God, and lat as faste go
Right to the effect, withouten tales mo (ii, 1564-1566).

But al passe I, lest ye to longe dwelle;
For for o fyn is al that ever I telle (ii, 1595-1596).

In both these places Chaucer picks up and continues the effect of what he had said about condensing the letter (ii, 1219-1220). *There,*

¹ See, however, Young, pp. 173-176, where especial attention is given to Antigone's song (ii. 827-875). The general source of this lyric I believe to be Guillaume de Machaut (*Modern Language Notes*, XXV, 158); but it is certainly in most respects Chaucer's own.

² I pass over ii, 1700-1701, though (in strictness) this passage belongs to the same class as those mentioned below, p. 97, note 1.

³ *Filostrato*, ii, 121-127.

he was actually condensing Boccaccio; here he is not condensing anybody, but inventing, and at considerable length. Yet in both cases he wishes the reader to think that he is faithful to his auctor Lollius, though with some abridgement.

Chaucer's procedure, then, as far as the end of Book ii, is quite clear. Having introduced his "auctor Lollius" — his pretended authority for the whole *Troilus* — early in book i (at 394), he recalls him to the reader's mind at convenient intervals. These credits sometimes accord with material that is in the *Filostrato*, but they oftener refer or apply to material that is not. So far, therefore, Lollius is not Boccaccio or anybody else but Lollius — the supposed writer on Troy (celebrated as such in *The House of Fame*) from whom Chaucer (in a fiction) professes to have derived all his material — a Latin writer whom he translates rather closely, never departing from him without due notice.

The proem to Book iii, though not mentioning any *auctor*, is meant to recall (in 39-49) the fiction of fidelity in translating already set forth with such care in the proem to Book ii. We should note the close connection between ii, 13-14, and iii, 43-44:

That of no sentement I this endyte,
But out of Latin in my tonge it wryte (ii, 13-14).

Ye in my naked herte sentement
Inhelde, and do me shewe of thy swetnesse (iii, 43-44).

Chaucer picks up this fiction again in iii, 90-91:

His [Troilus'] resons [i.e., his words] as I may my rymes holde,
[i.e., as well as I can reproduce them in rhyme,]

I yow wol telle, as techen bokes olde.¹

What follows (92-238) is not in the *Filostrato*, and the whole scene is Chaucer's invention. At 450, however, the matter referred to as "writen in geste" ² does occur in that poem. Here we have a device

¹ "Bokes olde" means obviously either "myn auctor Lollius" (with a generalizing plural), or "myn auctor Lollius and other old books." The distinction does not affect our argument.

² *Filostrato*, ii, 84 (Cummings, p. 157). It should be noted, however, that this ascription, though it may perhaps be admitted as favoring the equation *Lollius* = *Boccaccio*, is by no means a firm buttress for that formula, since "as writen is in

which is several times employed in the *Troilus*: — a detail is mentioned (442-448) as to which the poet professes ignorance, and to this succeeds a fact (introduced by *but*, 449) which he does know, or does find in his *auctor*.¹

Almost immediately after this Chaucer once more suggests condensation ("shortly of this proces for to pace," iii, 470) though the whole passage is his own. Then come the famous stanzas in which he forestalls criticism (iii, 491-504): "Someone may expect me to rehearse every word and message and look. But that would be tedious, and nobody ever heard of its being done in any history. Besides, even if I wished, I could not;

"For there was som epistel hem bitwene,
That wolde, as seyth myn auctor, wel contene
Neigh half this book, of which him list not write;
How sholde I thanne a lyne of it endite?" (iii, 501-504).

Boccaccio says nothing of the kind. *Auctor*, then, is certainly not Boccaccio.

The next mention of a source is likewise decisive:

Nought myn auctor fully to declare
What that she thoughte whan he seyde so,
That Troilus was out of town y-fare,
As if he seyde ther-of sooth or no;
But that, with-oute awayt, with him to go,
She graunted him, sith he hir that bisoughte,
And, as his nece, obeyed as hir oughte. (iii, 575-581).

This stanza contains two statements about "myn auctor": — (1) that he does not make it quite clear whether Cressida believed Pandarus; (2) that he *does* assert that she accepted her uncle's invitation.² Now Boccaccio asserts nothing of the kind, for the important incident

"geste" really covers iii, 451-490, and the Boccaccian passage is no adequate source for much of this. Boccaccio, indeed, seems to allow no actual meeting between the lovers until the night when Cressida yields. Chaucer, on the contrary, declares that they had several interviews in the meantime. On the whole, then, this ascription is rather against the equation than for it.

¹ For similar cases, see i, 492-497; ii, 1700-1701; iii, 575-581, 967-973, 1369-1372; iv, 36-42. The device is a natural one, but we may note that its first employment in the *Troilus* (i, 492-497) comes from the *Filostrato* (i, 48).

² For the manner of citation, see p. 96, above.

of the visit to Pandarus is of Chaucer's own imagining. The passage would be enough, without further evidence, to destroy the equation *auctor Lollius = Boccacio*.

Very similar is the next allusion to a source, which comes some fifty-odd stanzas later in the same episode:

Can I not seyn, for she bad him not ryse,
If sorwe it putte out of hir remembraunce,
Or elles if she tok it in the wyse
Of duëtee, as for his observaunce;
But wel finde I she dide him this pleasaunce,
That she him kiste, al-though she syked sore;
And bad him sitte a-doun with-uten more (iii, 967-973).

Here Chaucer begins by telling us that he does not know why Cressida neglected to bid Troilus rise (presumably because his auctor Lollius did not inform him), and then adds something that he *does* "find" (in Lollius — where else?). Again no word of all this in Boccaccio! The same device (where also there is no such matter in the *Filostrato*) recurs in iii, 1369-1372. Here Chaucer says that he cannot tell the posies on the rings interchanged by the lovers, but that he *does* "know well" (i.e., of course, because he found it in Lollius) that Cressida gave Troilus a gold and azure brooch in which was set a ruby shaped like a heart.

A little before this last passage (namely, in iii, 1193-1197), Chaucer expressly mentions his fictitious *auctor*:

I can no more, but of thise ilke tweye,
To whom this tale sucre be or soot,
Though that I tarie a yeer, *som-tyme I moot*
After myn auctor tellen hir gladnesse,
As wel as I have told hir hevinesse (iii, 1193-1197).

The "hevinesse" of the lovers (iii, 1197) is described and narrated, with a wealth of vivid detail in iii, 792-1183, and this passage of nearly 400 lines does not come from Boccaccio, even in the most general way.¹ The "gladnesse" of the lovers (iii, 1196) is described and narrated, with a wealth of vivid detail, in iii, 1198-1414, and of this passage of about 200 lines only about a third is taken from the *Filo-*

¹ The parallels between the *Troilus* and the *Filocolo* quoted by Young, pp. 143 ff., may be accepted without affecting my argument here.

strato. Yet Chaucer declares with emphasis in iii, 1193-97, which looks before and after, forming a transition from one of these highly original passages to the other, that he has followed his *auctor* in the first and means to follow him likewise in the second, — indeed that he *must* follow him if he is to tell the story. Nowhere in the poem are his disclaimers and his protestation of faithfulness to his *auctor* more striking. Indeed, in iii, 1198, after he has proceeded to the extent of just one verse in the “gladnesse” scene, he reiterates his profession of fidelity in the words, “As writen clerkes¹ in hir bokes olde”:

Criseyde, which that felte hir thus ytake,
As writen clerkes in hir bokes olde,
Right as an aspes leef she gan to quake (iii, 1197-1199).

The only clerk who ever wrote this in his old book was Geoffrey Chaucer himself. But he is not yet content with the emphasis that he has laid upon his faithfulness to Lollius. In iii, 1321-1330, he actually interrupts his account of the lovers’ “gladnesse” to cite his *auctor* and protest fidelity again:

Awey, thou foule daunger and thou fere,
And lat hem in this hevene blisse dwelle,
That is so heygh, that al ne can I telle!

But sooth is, though I can not tellen al,
As can myn auctor, of his excellence,
Yet have I seyde (and god to-forn) and shal
In every thing al hoolly his sentence;
And if that I, at loves reverence,
Have any word in-ched for the beste,
Doth therewith-al right as your-selven leste (iii, 1321-1330).

“Tellen al” in v. 1324 applies (like the same phrase in v. 1323) to the details of “this hevene blisse.” The meaning is unmistakable. “My *auctor*,” the poet avers, “gives complete details of the lovers’ happiness, but I am unable to reproduce them in full, for I have not his ability;”² yet so far in this description, I have reproduced his meaning at every point, condensing more or less, and only now and then insert-

¹ *Clerkes* with their *bokes olde* is manifestly a mere variation of *myn auctor* (three lines before); but if we choose to take it in the sense of “myn auctor and others,” no harm is done.

² Cf. ii, 8-21, 1219-1220; iii, 39-48; iv, 799-805; v, 1769.

ing a word. And in the rest of the scene I shall do likewise."¹ The plain truth is very different from Chaucer's artistic fiction: — in that portion of the "gladnesse" scene which immediately precedes — about 125 verses (iii, 1198-1320) — he has been almost completely original, borrowing only a dozen lines or so from Boccaccio, and in the rest of this scene (iii, 1338-1414) he expands Boccaccio by about twenty per cent. The whole of the "gladnesse" scene, as I have already noted (iii, 1198-1414), is only about one-third Boccaccio's, and the scene of "hevinesse" (iii, 792-1183) — ascribed to "myn auctor" with equal emphasis — is not in Boccaccio at all.

Here it may be well to consider the Visit to Pandarus as a whole (iii, 512-1582). The narrative is suggested, no doubt, by Boccaccio's account of Troilus' visit to Cressida,² but Chaucer has cut loose from

¹ The reference here is not to a general procedure throughout the poem, but to procedure in this scene. The apologetic words of the poet interrupt his account of the lovers' transports, which is resumed at 1338. Chaucer's disclaimer in iii, 1322-1325 is adapted from two passages in the *Filostrato*:

Lungo sarebbe a raccontar la festa,
E impossibile a dire il diletto
Che insieme preser pervenuti in questa (iii, 31);

O dolce notte, e molto disiata,
Chente fostu alli due lieti amanti!
Se la scienza mi fosse donata
Che ebbero i poeti tutti quanti,
Per me non potrebbe esser disegnata! (iii, 33).

It is immensely significant with reference to Chaucer's Lollian fiction that, whereas Boccaccio remarks that even if he had "all the skill of all the poets" he could not do justice to the subject, Chaucer, in adapting the passage, declares that his *auctor* was fully competent and gave a complete and detailed account, but that he [the translator] cannot reproduce all these details, for lack of skill.

Of course Chaucer knew that he had been expanding enormously in this scene, and this knowledge doubtless added zest to his remark (appended to his profession of condensing or omitting) that he might have put in a word here and there to make the translation clearer ("have any word in-ched for the beste"). This would inevitably be understood by any one who was taken in by Chaucer's pretence of translating from Lollius as referring merely to such occasional insertions of a word or two as are necessary in translating from Latin prose or verse into English rhymes.

² *Filostrato*, iii, 21-55. Some details appear to have been suggested by the *Filocolo* (see Young, pp. 139 ff.).

the *Filostrato* and written, as all admit, a highly original episode, utilizing only such material in the Italian as suited his purpose. Boccaccio's account occupies less than 300 verses; Chaucer's narrative extends to more than a thousand. Yet Chaucer not only cites his *auctor* just before the episode (iii, 502), but also, in the course of the episode itself, makes several professions (express or implied) that he is faithfully following that *auctor* to the best of his ability, and contracting rather than expanding (iii, 575-581, 967-973, 1193-1199, 1323-1330, 1369-1372). There is one more suggestion of condensing in the very last part of the episode (iii, 1576), though the particular incident (1555-1582) does not occur in Boccaccio at all. This state of things would be enough to prove the impossibility of seriously equating Lollius with Boccaccio rather than with *himself*, *Lollius*, the alleged source of practically everything in the poem.¹

Book iii closes after some 200 more verses, about half of them from Boccaccio, but it does not close without a sweeping assertion from

¹ I pass over iii, 1774-1775, since here Chaucer is merely appealing to books in general — i.e., the authorities on Trojan history — for the detail that Troilus was second only to Hector in prowess. Most of the stanza, including the phrase in question ("se non erra La storia") comes from the *Filostrato* (iii, 90), but this particular detail is not found there. The celebration of Troilus as next to Hector in prowess occurs five times in Chaucer's poem:

1. The wyse worthy Ector the secounde (ii, 158).
2. For out and out he is the worthieste
Save only Ector, which that is the beste (ii, 739-740).
3. And certeynly, but-if that bokes erre,
Save Ector most ydrad of any wight (iii, 1774-1775).
4. For whom [i.e. Hector] as olde bokes tellen us,
Was mad swich wo that tonge it may not telle, —
And namely the sorwe of Troilus,
That next him was of worthinesse welle (v, 1562-1565).
5. As he that was withouten any pere,
Save Ector, in his tyme, as I can here (v, 1803-1804).

Passages 1, 2, and 5 are not in Boccaccio; 3 has just been discussed. The mourning for Hector is mentioned in the *Filostrato* (viii, 1) as well as in Benoit (16317 ff. Constans, 16265 ff. Joly) and Guido (ed. 1489, sig. i. 4, fol. 3), but the rank of Troilus as second to Hector is not specified in that context by any one of the three. The detail is well covered by both Benoit and Guido elsewhere; still, the particular phrase "Ector the secounde" certainly seems to come from Guido: "alius Hector vel secundus ab ipso" (sig. e 2 v°): see Hamilton, p. 76; Young, pp. 108-111.

Chaucer of fidelity to his *auctor*: — "Thanks and praise to thee, O Lady Venus, and to thy son Cupid, and to you, O Muses!

"That ye thus far han deyned me to gyde,
I can not more but (syn that ye wol wende) —
Ye heried been for ay withouten ende!

"Thourgh yow have I said fully in my song
The effect and ioye of Troilus servyse
(Al be that ther was som disese among)
As to myn auctor listeth to devise.
My thridde book now ende I in this wyse —
And Troilus in lust and in quiete
Is with Criseyde, his owne herte swete" (iii, 1811-1820).

The beginning of Book iv is continuous with the end of Book iii:

But al to litel, weylawey the whyle!
Lasteth swich ioye — ythanked be Fortune,
That semeth trewest whan she wol begyle,
And can to foles so hir song entune
That she hem hent and blent, traytour comune!
And whan a wight is from hir wheel ythrowe,
Than laugheth she and maketh him the mowe.

From Troilus she gan hir brighte face
Awey to wrythe, and took of him non hede,
But caste him clene out of his lady grace,
And on hir wheel she sette up Diomede;
For which right now myn herte ginneth blede,
And now my penne, alas! with which I wryte,
Quaketh for drede of that I moot endyte.

For how Criseyde Troilus forsook,
Or at the leste, how that she was unkinde,
Mot hennes-forth ben matere of my book,
As wryten folk thorough which it is in minde.
Allas! that they should ever cause finde
To speke hir harm; and if they on hir lye,
Y-wis, hem-self sholde han the vilanye (iv, 1-21).

The plural in the last four lines does not suggest any purpose to forsake "myn auctor Lollius," but — if it must be taken literally, and not as a mere variant — merely implies that Lollius is here supported by other authorities. The whole passage (iii, 1811-iv, 21) would assuredly confirm the impression (already fixed in the reader's mind

by much protesting) that Chaucer has followed his one *auctor* closely and intends to follow him closely to the end, never departing from him without due notice.

References or allusions to a source are not common in Book iv; but there are enough of them to keep alive the reader's impression that Chaucer is faithful to his single *auctor*. In iv, 36-42, we have another example of a device already treated:¹ — avowed ignorance of some detail *plus* avowed knowledge of something else. "I do not know how long the interval was, but — the day of battle came," etc. This amounts to alleging that "myn auctor does not define the interval but *does* narrate *ut sequitur*." Here, so it happens, the reference is true to Boccaccio.²

In iv, 799-805, however, we have a curious piece of Lollian mystification.

How mighte it ever yred ben or ysonge,
The pleynte that she made in hir distresse?
I noot; but, as for me, my litel tonge,
If I discreven wolde hir hevinesse,
It sholde make hir sorwe seme lesse
Than that it was, and childishly deface
Hir heigh compleynte, and therefore I it pace.

Chaucer would have us believe that his original afforded a fuller account of Cressida's lament, which he is unable to reproduce because of his feeble powers: that is, he exalts his *auctor* at his own expense and pretends to summarize or omit.³ In fact, however, he gives Cressida's complaint at almost exactly the same length which it has in Boccaccio,⁴ and even his disclaimer is a kind of translation, emphasized so as to accord with his regular pose of lack of wit:⁵

Chi potrebbe giammai narrare a pieno
Ciò che Criseida nel pianto dicea?
Certo non io, che al fatto il dir vien meno,
Tant' era la sua noia cruda e rea (iv, 95).

Here, then, Chaucer uses the very words of Boccaccio to produce the effect of condensing Lollius at a time when, in fact, he is following

¹ P. 97, above.

² *Filostrato*, iv, 1-2.

³ We have observed the same device in iii, 1321-1330 (p. 99, above).

⁴ *Filocolo*, iv, 88-94.

⁵ Cf. p. 99, note 2, above.

Boccaccio without condensation. Lollius, therefore, is not Boccaccio, any more than Chaucer himself becomes identical with Boccaccio by using "I" where the Italian uses "io."

Stanza 203 of this Fourth Book (1415-1421) may perhaps be dismissed as ambiguous evidence. "As writen wel I fynde" (1415) would naturally mean "as I find in Lollius," and then "Thus writen they that of hir werkes knewe" (1421) would be either a loose generalizing plural for "myn auctor," or a real defining plural equivalent to "myn auctor" and other writers. The detail concerned is Cressida's honest purpose and her genuine sorrow at parting, and we have the same assertion of her grief, with a similar plural reference, in v, 15-21 ("as men in bokes rede"). Both Boccaccio¹ and Benoit² do, in fact, emphasize this point. Clearly, however, the occasional use of a plural like *bokes* or *they* amounts at most only to the occasional citation of subsidiary authorities to corroborate Lollius, and has a tendency rather to establish than to shaken the reader's faith in Chaucer's carefully fostered fiction that he is a conscientious translator from the Latin of that vanished ancient. This fiction, therefore, is still maintained at the beginning of Book v.

And so we arrive at the highly felicitous incident of Diomedes's flirtation *en route* (v, 92-189). This incident was suggested by Benoit;³ there is not a touch of it in Boccaccio. Yet Chaucer gives no hint that he is here departing from his *auctor*, and the reader has therefore every reason to infer that the episode in question is Lollian. Immediately after the wooing, Chaucer begins to follow Boccaccio again (at v, 190) and keeps reasonably close to him, though indulging in considerable freedom, until we reach the next indication of source (v, 799). From 92 to 799, then, there is no indication on the poet's part that he is indebted to anybody but Lollius. Yet in 92-189 his source (so far as he is not original) is Benoit, while in 190-798 his source (so far as he is not original) is Boccaccio. It is idle, then, to assert that Lollius is Boccaccio unless one is willing to admit that Boccaccio is Benoit!

¹ *Filostrato*, v, 1 and 6-7.

² 13495 ff. Constans (13469 ff. Joly). Guido, on the contrary, apostrophizes Troilus in a very different spirit: "Sed, o Troile, quae te tam iuuenilis errare coegit credulitas vt Briseide lacrimis crederes deceptiuis et eius blandiciis?" and he proceeds to lampoon the whole sex (ed. 1489, sig. i 2).

³ 13529-13702 Constans (13499-13666 Joly).

The celebrated set of portraits or characters — Diomedes, Cressida, Troilus — in v, 799–840, is a digression, and has a somewhat complicated genesis.¹ The passage contains four indications of source. The first, “as bokes us declare” (799), though applying (if strictly taken) to Diomedes’s portrait alone, may well enough be regarded as introducing the whole set. If so, the “bokes” would naturally be understood by the reader (as in the case of the plurals just discussed) to mean “my auctor Lollius and other authorities.” The effect of having consulted more books than one at this point is enhanced by “and som men seyn” (804) and by “they writen that hire syen” (816). As for “in storie it is yfounde” (834), that means only “as history tells us,” and thus ranges with the plural ascriptions that precede, since all educated persons in the fourteenth century knew that there were several extant accounts of the Trojan War. There is no hint that the subsidiary authorities are inconsistent with Lollius in the points here discussed. They are, we are to infer, either confirmatory or supplementary. The Lollian fiction remains, then, in full force.

In the account of Diomedes’s successful pressing of his suit (v, 841–1036), Chaucer four times pretends to be condensing: — “At shorte wordes for to telle” (848); “What sholde I telle his wordes that he seide?” (946); “But in effect, and shortly for to seye” (1009); “And shortly, lest that ye my tale breke” (1032). In fact, he is following Boccaccio (vi, 9–34) with a fair degree of closeness, *but not really condensing him*; for Boccaccio has 208 verses, Chaucer has 196. I do not wish to press the point, however, and am quite willing to allow this passage to stand to the credit of the much battered formula *Lollius = Boccaccio*.

What follows immediately, however, is of much significance on the other side. I must quote v, 1037–1057:

And after this *the story telleth us*
 That she him yaf the faire baye stede
 The which she ones wan of Troilus;
 And eek a broche (and that was litle nede) 1040
 That Troilus was she yaf this Diomedes;

¹ The sources are Boccaccio and (mediately or immediately, or both) the portraits drawn by Dares (cap. 12), as well as the epic of Josephus Iscanus (who also drew from Dares). That Joseph was used by Chaucer has been revealed by Root, whose paper in *Modern Philology* is eagerly awaited (see the references in Cummings, p. 80).

And eek, the bet from sorwe him to releve,
She made him were a pencil of hir sleve.

I finde eek in the stories elleswhere,
Whan through the body hurt was Diomedé, 1045
Of Troilus, tho weep she many a tere
Whan that she saugh his wyde woundes blede,
And that she took to kepen him good hede;
And, for to hele him of his sorwes smerte,
Men seyn (I noot) that she yaf him hir herte. 1050

But trewely, *the story telleth us,*
Ther made never womman more wo
Than she, whan that she falsed Troilus.
She seyde, Alas! for now is clene a-go
My name of trouthe in love, for ever-mo! 1055
For I have falsed oon the gentileste
That ever was, and oon the worthieste!

"The story" in 1037 is of course "myn auctor Lollius," and equally of course, it is the same *auctor* (Chaucer means to imply) that he has followed in the account just preceding (841-1036). Now the facts are (1) that 841-1036 are mainly (though not exclusively) from Boccaccio, as we have seen; (2) that the steed is from Benoit;¹ (3) that the brooch is from Boccaccio;² and (4) that the "pencil" is from Benoit.³ If Boccaccio is Lollius, then, Benoit is Lollius by the same token, and once more we have proved that Boccaccio is Benoit!

But to continue. "In the stories elsewhere" (1044) either implies a departure from the source that Chaucer has been following in the first stanza or it does not. If it does imply such a departure, it is a misstatement, for the incident reported is from Benoit;⁴ if it does not imply such a departure, then it means "elsewhere in Lollius." On either alternative, the equation *Boccaccio* = *Lollius* is excluded.

At all events, "the story" in 1051 manifestly means the same history that is cited in 1037, — that is, Lollius. Yet what follows in 1052-1085 is not from Boccaccio but from Benoit,⁵ with Chaucer's own additions.⁶

¹ 14286-14324, 15114-15115 Constans (14238-14276, 15046-15047 Joly).

² *Filostrato*, viii, 9-10; cf. *Troilus*, v, 1660-1666.

³ 15176-15178 Constans (15104 ff., Joly).

⁴ 20202 ff. Constans (20193-20,274 Joly).

⁵ 20229-20317 Constans (20221-20308, Joly).

⁶ Stanzas 156-157 (v, 1086-1099) throw no light on the Lollian fiction. "Non

With 1100 Chaucer returns to Troilus, and the reader naturally supposes (as Chaucer intends him to suppose) that the same source is to be followed as heretofore — Lollius, just referred to as “the story” in 1051. This impression will naturally extend to whatever is narrated until there is a further express indication of source,¹ — that is, it will cover the contents of 1100–1650, — up to 1651, where “the storie” is once more cited. Lollius, then, is responsible for the contents of 1100–1650. These, briefly analyzed, are —

- (1) 1100–1456, mostly from Boccaccio;
- (2) 1457–1512, from Ovid and the *Thebaid*;
- (3) 1513–1534, from Boccaccio, with additions;
- (4) 1535–1561, original and from Benoit;
- (5) 1562–1589, mostly from Boccaccio;
- (6) 1590–1631, Cressida's letter, original;
- (7) 1632–1650, from Boccaccio.

Thus Lollius becomes a somewhat complicated worthy. Yet he it is whom Chaucer means us to accept as the source of this mosaic (v, 1100–1650), and his intention, clear enough already, is emphasized by another reference to “the storie” at this point (1651). It will be best to quote three stanzas:

Stood on a day in his melencolye
 This Troilus, and in suspicioun
 Of hir for whom he wende for to dye.
 And so bifel, that through-out Troye toun,
 As was the gyse, y-bore was up and doun 1650
 A maner cote-armure, as seyth the storie,
 Biforn Deiphebe, in signe of his victorie,

auctor” (1088) means “neither Lollius (my authority in this work) nor any other writer whom I have consulted on this point.” “The story” in 1094 may mean either Lollius or “the history in general” (i. e., the Trojan story). All the authorities (Benoit, Guido, and Boccaccio) blame Cressida. Thus these verses are ambiguous evidence in our discussion.

¹ The “olde bokes” mentioned in v, 1562–1565, as testifying to the lamentation for Hector count on neither side in our discussion. The reference is merely casual and vouches for an incidental detail. It suggests no turning aside from the main line of translation. The detail, anyhow, is found in all three authorities — Boccaccio (*Filostrato*, viii, 1; *Teseide*, xi, 7), Benoit, and Guido. “Olde stories” in v, 1459, and “olde bokes” in 1478 and 1481, are ascriptions by Cassandra and do not count. Cf. Pandarus’ “bokes twelve” for the *Thebaid* (ii, 108), and Troilus’ “as men in bokes rede” (iii, 1429).

The whiche cote, *as telleth Lollius*,
 Deiphebe it hadde y-rent from Diomede
 The same day; and whan this Troilus 1655
 It saugh, he gan to taken of it hede,
 Avysing of the length and of the brede,
 And al the werk; but as he gan biholde,
 Ful sodeinly his herte gan to colde,

 As he that on the coler fond with-inne 1660
 A broche, that he Criseyde yaf that morwe
 That she from Troye moste nedes twinne,
 In remembraunce of him and of his sorwe;
 And she him leyde ayein hir feyth to borwe
 To kepe it ay; but now, ful wel he wiste, 1665
 His lady nas no longer on to triste (v, 1646-1666).

By "the storie" in 1651 Chaucer means the reader to understand the same authority mentioned (in the same terms) in 1037 and 1051. But, since he has not called him by name for a good while, and since the poem is drawing to a close, he adds "*as telleth Lollius*," and thus fixes his *auctor* in our minds forever.

It is quite true that the detail of the coat-armor is found in Boccaccio, and in Boccaccio alone.¹ But Chaucer's manifest purpose here is not simply to credit Lollius with a particular detail, but likewise to recall the name itself to our minds as that of the *auctor* whom he has consistently pretended to follow from the outset. This fiction of fidelity to Lollius is in no wise weakened or contravened by the few instances in which Chaucer suggests that he has consulted other old writers. For in these instances, as we have seen, the other ancients either agree with Lollius (such is the fiction intended) or supplement him in some incidental matter. Anyhow, the total amount of material thus alleged as supplementary is a mere nothing — and the fiction of fidelity to Lollius gains rather than loses in verisimilitude by such references. For we naturally infer, as I have said before, that Lollius is never abandoned, even for a moment, without due notice.

And so it results from our examination of the numerous passages in which Chaucer thus far refers or alludes to his *auctor*, — there are nearly 40 of them, or an average of one for every 200 lines — that Lollius stands for the source not merely of what Chaucer has actually

¹ *Filostrato*, viii, 8-10.

taken from Boccaccio, but, with a few minute exceptions, for what he has actually taken from Benoit and Statius and Guillaume de Machaut and Boëthius and Ovid and — more important still — what he has derived from his own imagination. Lollius is nobody but Lollius — a real personage (as Chaucer thought) from whom, in a fiction, he pretends to translate his poem.

There is nothing in the 200 lines that remain (v, 1667-1869) that modifies these pregnant and unforced conclusions.¹ Two places, however, need citation. First, in v, 1765-1771, Chaucer reverts to the distinction he made at the very beginning (i, 141-147) and points out the difference between his matter (i.e., the material that he has found in the lost author Lollius) and the well-known tale of Troy as recorded by Dares. This distinction helps, of course, to maintain the fiction of a Lollian source, a long-lost manuscript discovered by Chaucer when the stars were propitious. Second, in 1854-1855 he seems to imply that Lollius wrote in verse, like "Virgil, Ovide, Omer, Lucan, and Stace":

Lo here the forme of olde clerkes speche
In poetrye, if ye hir bokes seche!

This point, however, may be waived. At all events, Chaucer has informed us unequivocally that Lollius wrote his *Troilus* story in Latin (ii, 14), and that alone is enough to show that Chaucer did not mean him to be Boccaccio.

¹ "I finde" (v, 1758), following "As men may in thes olde bokes rede" (1753), means apparently, "I find in these old books." The whole passage (1751-1764) is true to Boccaccio (*Filostrato*, viii, 25-26) and may be counted, if one wishes, in favor of the equation so often referred to; but it does not disturb the impression that Chaucer's consistently followed source is Lollius, and that impression disproves the equation. "Other bokes" in 1776, and "as I can here" in 1804 prove nothing either way.

APPENDIX II

USE OF THE TESEIDE IN THE TROILUS

Three stanzas of the *Troilus* (v, 1807-1827) have long been recognized as an almost literal translation from the *Teseide* (xi, 1-3). The following imitation, almost equally literal, has not been noted:¹

On hevene yet the sterres were sene,
 Although ful pale ywoxen was the mone,
 And whyten gan the orisonte shene
 Al estward, as it woned is to done;
 And Phebus with his rosy carte sone
 Gan after that to dresse him up to fare,
 Whan Troilus hath sent after Pandare (v, 274-280).

Il ciel tutte le stelle ancor mostrava,
 Benchè Febea già palida fosse;
 E l'orizzonte tutto biancheggiava
 Nell' oriente, e eransi già mosse
 L'Ore, e col carro, in cui la luce stava,
 Giungevano i cavaï, vedendo rosse
 Le membra del celeste bue levato,
 Dall' amica Titonia accompagnato (vii, 94).

Only three stanzas after this striking imitation comes another passage in which Chaucer certainly remembered the *Teseide*. It is the beautiful address of Troilus to his friend in expectation of death, and the deathbed of Arcita is what was in the poet's mind. Troilus sends for Pandarus as Arcita for Palemone² and confides to him his last wishes. He speaks of "the fyr and flaumbe funeral" that is to consume his body,³ of "the pleyes palestral" (a phrase⁴ which Chaucer

¹ Dr. B. A. Wise (*The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, p. 21) compares *Thebaid*, xii, 1-4, which may well be the original of Boccaccio's verses, but Chaucer was rendering Boccaccio here.

² *Troilus*, v, 280; *Teseide*, x, 37. This line of the *Troilus* closes the stanza just noted as almost literally rendered from *Teseide*, vii, 94, and the speech of Troilus begins after two stanzas of transition.

³ v, 302-303; cf. *Teseide*, xi, 13-14.

⁴ *Troilus*, v, 304: cf. *Teseide*, vii, 4 ("un palestral giuoco"), 27 ("mio palestral giuoco"); Theseus, to honor the dead Arcita, contends "nell'unta palestra" at

got from the *Teseide*). and requests that his steed may be offered to Mars and his arms to Pallas.¹

His final request relates to his ashes:

The poudre in which myn herte ybrend shal torne,
That preye I thee thou take and it conserve
In a vessel that men clepeth an urne,
Of gold, and to my lady that I serve,
For love of whom thus pitously I sterve,
So yeve it hir, and do me this plesaunce,
To preye hir kepe it for a remembraunce (v, 309-315).

Egeo vi ritornò il dì seguente,
E con pietosa man tutte raccolse
Le ceneri da capo prima spente
Con molto vino, e di terra le tolse,
Ed in un' urna d'oro umilmente
Le mise, e quella in cari drappi involse,
E nel tempio di Marte fe' guardare
Fin ch'altro loco le potesse dare (xi, 58).²

Palemone has a temple built,

Ed in quel volle che 'l cener guardato
Fosse d'Arcita, in eterna memoria
Del suo valore e della sua vittoria (xi, 69).

In the midst of the temple was set up a column,

sopra la qual d'oro lucente
Un' urna fu discretamente sita:
Dentro la qual la cenere tepente
Fece servare del suo amico Arcita (xi, 90).³

Troilus ends with a prayer to Mercury:

And, god Mercurie, of me now, woful wrecche,
The soule gyde, and whan thee list it fecche! (v, 321-322).

the "giuochi" (xi, 59, 62). *Teseide*, xi, 62, is cited by Young, *The Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Creseyde*, p. 177 (see Skeat on *Troilus*, v, 304). Cf. Wise, *The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, pp. 21-22.

¹ v, 306-308; cf. *Teseide*, xi, 35, 52, 55-56 (see Skeat on *Troilus*, v, 306).

² This comparison is made by Young, pp. 177-178 (cf. Wise, pp. 21-22; Cummings, p. 79).

³ Cf. the argument of *Teseide*, xi; also (for urns), ii, 74, 81 (called *vaselli* in ii, 83).

This is a plain reminiscence of Arcita's prayer to the same god,¹ as well of his wish for sacrifice to be made to him: —

Amici cari, io me ne vo dicerto,
Perch' io vorrei a Mercurio litare,
Acciò che esso, per sì fatto merto,
In luogo ameno piacciagli portare
Lo spirto mio (x, 89).

The inscription on Arcita's urn, in which the urn itself is made to speak the epitaph, is justly admired by every reader:

Io servo dentro a me le reverende
Del buon Arcita ceneri, per cui
Debito sacrificio qui si rende.
E chiunque ama, per esempio lui
Pigli, se amor di soverchio l' accende:
Perocchè dicer può: qual se' io fui,
E per Emilia usando il mio valore
Mori: dunque ti guarda da Amore (xi, 91).

Chaucer remembered this epitaph when he wrote the very different stanza, still more beautiful, in which Troilus addresses those lovers in future days who shall pass by his tomb:

O ye lovers that heigh upon the wheel
Ben set of Fortune in good aventure,
God leve that ye finde ay love of steel,
And longe mot your lyf in ioye endure!
But whan ye comen by my sepulture,
Remembreth that your felawe resteth there;
For I lovede eek, though I unworthy were (iv, 323-329).

Chaucer's use of the *Teseide* in the *Troilus*, proved by the foregoing examples, seems to have begun in his First Book. It appears to be discernible in the quotation that Pandarus makes from Oenone's letter:

"Phebus, that first fond art of medicyne,"
Quod she, "and coude in every wightes care
Remede and reed, by herbes he knew fyne,
Yet to him-self his conninge was ful bare;
For love hadde him so bounden in a snare,
Al for the doughter of the kinge Admete,
That al his craft ne coude his sorwe bete" (i, 659-665).

¹ *Teseide*, x, 93-98.

This, as Skeat remarks, is "not at all a literal translation" of *Heroïdes*, v, 149-152, though it "gives the general sense."

Quaecumque herba potens ad opem radixque medendi
 Utilis in toto nascitur orbe, mea est.
 Me miseram, quod amor non est medicabilis herbis!
 Deficior prudens artis ab arte mea.
 Ipse repertor opis vaccas pavissee Pheraeas
 Fertur et e nostro saucius igne fuit.
 Quod nec graminibus tellus fecunda creandis
 Nec deus, auxilium tu mihi ferre potes (v, 147-154).

The words of Palemone in *Teseide*, iii, 25, may have influenced Chaucer here:

O quanto ne sarieno a tal fedita
 Gli argomenti esculapii buoni e sani,
 Il qual dicien che tornerebbe in vita
 Con erbe i lacerati corpi umani!
 Ma che dich' io? *Poichè Apollo, sentita*
Cotal saetta, che i succhi mondani
Tutti conobbe, non seppe vedere
Medela a sè che potesse valere.

Cf. *Teseide*, iv, 46 (Arcita's words this time, in a prayer to Apollo):

Siccome te alcuna volta Amore
 Costrinse il chiaro cielo abbandonare,
 E lungo Anfriso in forma di pastore
 Del grande Admeto gli armenti guardare,¹
 Così or me il possente signore
 Qui in Atene ha fatto ritornare,
 Contra al mandato che mi fe' Teseo
 Allora ch'a Peritoo mi rendeo.

In Book ii, it is worth while to compare verses 50-56 with three beautiful stanzas in the *Teseide*.

In May, that mother is of monthes glade,
 That fresshe flowers, blewe and whyte and rede,
 Ben quike agayn, that winter dede made,
 And ful of bawme is fleting every mede;
 When Phebus doth his brighte bemes sprede
 Right in the whyte Bole, it so bitidde
 As I shal singe, on Mayes day the thridde (ii, 50-56).

¹ See also *Teseide*, vi, 55; x, 13, 25.

*Febo, salendo con li suoi cavalli,
 Del ciel teneva l' umile animale
 Che Europa portò senza intervalli
 Là dove il nome suo dimora avale;
 E con lui insieme graziosi stalli
 Venus facea de' passi con che sale:
 Perchè rideva il cielo tutto quanto
 D'Amon che 'n pesce dimorava intanto.*

*Da questa lieta vista delle stelle
 Prende la terra graziosi effetti,
 E rivestiva le sue parti belle
 Di nuove erbette e di vaghi fioretti;
 E le sue braccia le piante novelle
 Avean di fronde rivestite, e stretti
 Eran dal tempo gli alberi a fiorire
 Ed a far frutto, e 'l mondo rimbellire.*

*E gli uccelletti ancora i loro amori
 Incominciato avien tutti a cantare,
 Giulivi e gai nelle fronde e fiori;
 E gli animali nol potean celare,
 Anzi 'l mostravan con sembianti fuori;
 E' giovinetti lieti, che ad amare
 Eran disposti, sentivan nel core
 Fervente più che mai crescere amore (iii, 5-7).*

One is also reminded of the opening verses of *The Canterbury Tales*.¹
Troilus, ii, 64-71, has a certain resemblance to *Teseide*, iv, 73:

*The swalwe Proigne with a sorwful lay,
 Whan morwe com, gan make hir weymentinge,
 Why she forshapen was; and ever lay
 Pandare abedde, half in a slomeringe,
 Til she so neigh him made hir chiteringe,
 How Tereus gan forth hir suster take,
 That with the noyse of hir he gan awake,
 And gan to calle and dresse him up to ryse (ii, 64-71).*

*Allor sentendo cantar Filomena,
 Che si fa lieta del morto Tereo,
 Si drizza (iv, 73).²*

¹ Where Skeat well compares Guido, bk. iv (opening passage), ed. 1489, sig. d 2.
 Cf. also Petrarch, Sonnet 8 in *Vita*.

² Cited by Cummings, p. 54. Koeppel, *Anglia*, XIII, 184, compares *Purga-*

The following stanza in Pandarus' description of the prowess of Troilus (not in the *Filostrato*) appears to owe something to the *Teseide*:

Now here, now there, he hunted hem so faste,
There nas but Grekes blood and Troilus:
Now hem he hurte, and hem alle doun he caste.
Ay where he went it was arrayed thus:
He was hir deeth, and sheld and lyf for us;
That as that day ther dorste noon withstonde,
Whyl that he held his bloddy swerde in honde (ii, 197-203).

Esso ferì tra la gente più folta,
E colla spada si fece far via;
E questo qua, e quello là rivolta,
Costui abbatte, e quell' altro ferìa:
E combattendo dimostra la molta
Prodezza che Amor nel cor gli cria:
E' non ne giva nullo rispiarmando
Ma come fulgor tutti spaventando (viii, 81).

Dr. Cummings (p. 55) compares —

O cruel god, O dispitouse Marte,
O Furies three of helle, on yow I crye! (ii, 435-436).

with

O fiero Marte, o dispettoso iddio (i, 58);¹
Marte nella sua fredda regione
Colle sue furie insieme s'è tornato (iii, 1).

In *Troilus*, iii, 720-721, Venus is adjured to be favorable —

For love of him thou lovedest in the shawe,
I mene Adoon, that with the boor was slawe.

This may possibly have been suggested by *Teseide*, vii, 43:

O bella Dea del buon Vulcano sposa,
Per cui s'allegra il monte Citerone,

torio, ix, 13-15. I compare *Anth. Pal.*, v, 237. Wise, p. 63, declares that Petrarch's 42d sonnet (*in Morte*) is the source of *Troilus*, "ii, 50 f. and 64 f.":

Zefiro torna, e'l bel tempo rimena
Ei fiori e l'erbe, sua dolce famiglia,
E garrir Progne, e pianger Filomena,
E primavera candida e vermiglia.

¹ Wise, p. 62. In *Troilus*, iv, 22-24, it is impossible to doubt that Chaucer remembered Dante, *Inferno*, ix, 45 ff.

Deh, i' ti prego che mi sii pietosa
Per quello amor che portasti ad Adone.¹

At all events, Chaucer thought well enough of the passage to translate it pretty literally in the *Knight's Tale*, A, 2221-2225:

Fairest of faire, o lady myn, Venus,
Doughter of Iove and spouse of Vulcanus,
Thou glader of the mount of Citheroun,
For thilke love thou haddest to Adoun,
Have pitee of my bittre teres smerte.

Chaucer's confusion of Tithonus with "the sonne Tytan" in *Troilus*, iii, 1464-1470, may be due to Boccaccio's form *Titon* for Tithonus in *Teseide*, iv. 72:

E sempre si svegliava allora
Che de Titon partita vien l' Aurora.²

Skeat compares *Heroides*, xviii, 111-112, but omits 114, which is very pertinent; "Et querimur parvas noctibus esse moras." We should certainly add *Amores*, i, 13, which not only concerns Tithonus and Aurora but contains the original of certain lines in *Troilus'* address to Night:

Wel oughte bestes pleyne and folk thee chyde
That, ther-as day with labour wolde us breste,
That thou thus fleest, and deynest us nought reste! (iii, 1433-1435).

Cf. *Amores*, i, 13, 17ff., and in particular:

Prima bidente vides oneratos arva colentes,
Prima vocas tardos sub iuga panda boves (11-12).

Troilus, v, 8-12, is manifestly a close translation from the *Teseide*:

The golden-tressed Phebus heighe on-lofte
Thryes hadde al with his bemes shene
The snowes molte, and Zephirus as ofte
Ybrought ayein the tendre leves grene
Sin, etc.

¹ Cf. *Teseide*, vi, 42:

Nè crede alcun che sì bel fosse Adone
Di Cinira, da Vener tanto amato.

² Cummings, p. 70. Cf., however, *Purgatorio*, ix, 1-3; Petrarch, Sonnet 23 (*in Morte*).

Il sole avea due volte dissolute
 Le nevi agli alti poggj, ed altrettante
 Zefiro aveva le frondi rendute
 Ed i be' fiori alle spogliate piante,
 Poichè, etc. (ii, 1).¹

Chaucer's description of Cressida may owe something to Boccaccio's description of Emilia. I will not insist on the resemblance between *Troilus*, v, 809-812, and *Teseide*, xii, 54:

And ofte-tyme this was hir manere,
 To gon ytressed with hir heres clere
 Doun by hir coler at hir bak bihinde,
 Which with a thred of gold she wolde binde (v, 809-812).

Dico che li suoi crini parean d'oro,
 Non per treccia ristretti ma soluti,
 E pettinati sì che in fra loro
 Non n' era un torto, e cadean sostenuti
 Sopra li candidi omeri, nè foro
 Prima nè poi si be' giammai veduti:
 Nè altro sopra quelli ella portava
 Ch' una corona ch' assai si stimava (xii, 54).²

But his comment that Cressida's joined brows were the only defect in her beauty certainly reminds one of the particularity with which Boccaccio notes that Emilia's eyebrows *were* divided:

La fronte sua era ampia e spaziosa,
 E bianca e piana e molto dilicata,
 Sotto la quale in volta tortuosa,
 Quasi di mezzo cerchio terminata,
 Eran due ciglia più che altra cosa
 Nerissime e sottil, nelle qua' lata
 Bianchezza si videa lor dividendo,
 Nè 'l debito passavan sè estendendo (xii, 55).

Professor Root has discovered that verses 807-826 owe much to Josephus Iscanus, iv, 156-162;³ but Chaucer could never have unriddled the *joined eyebrows*⁴ from Joseph's tangled rhetoric ("Um-

¹ Cited by Wise, p. 62, who notes that Boccaccio is imitating *Thebaid*, iv, 1-3, and who compares also *Thebaid*, vii, 223-226. See Rossetti, p. 232.

² Hamilton, p. 79, compares *Troilus*, v, 809-812, with *Teseide*, vii, 65, 1-2. See Young, pp. 117-118.

³ See Cummings, p. 80.

⁴ On the eyebrows see Krapp, *Modern Language Notes*, XIX, 235; Hamilton,

braeque minoris Delicias oculus iunctos suspendit in arcus ") unless he had found that detail plainly expressed in Benoit or Guido or Dares.

"They writen that hire syen" (v, 816) suggests the words of Dares ("hos se vidisse," cap. 12), but it may likewise echo Boccaccio's address to the Muses when he is about to describe Emilia's "beauties": — "Voi le vedeste, e so che le sapete" (xii. 52).

We may note that Boccaccio gives a portrait of Palemone in *Teseide*, iii, 49, of Arcita in iii, 50.

The attack on the heathen Gods in *Troilus*, v, 1850, 1852-1853, may owe something to Emilia's blasphemy:

O dispietati iddii senza mercede,
Or che è questo che v' è in piacere?
Dov' è l'amore antico, ove la fede
Che solevate portare a' mondani?
Ella n' è gita con li venti vani (xi, 42).

This passage in Chaucer comes only four stanzas after his borrowing of *Teseide*, xi, 1-3 (*Troilus*, v, 1807-1827).

A few trifles (most or all of doubtful validity) may be added: — *Troilus*, ii, 816 (Flexippe), *Teseide*, viii, 43 (Plessippo); *Troilus*, iii 1427-1428, *Teseide*, iv, 14 (Wise, pp. 11-12); *Troilus*, iv, 789-790, *Teseide*, x, 94; *Troilus*, iv, 1586 (proverb), *Teseide*, xii, 11; *Troilus*, v, 599-602, *Teseide*, iii, 1 (Wise, p. 23, well compares Dante, *Inferno*, xxx, 1-3).¹

Troilus, ii, 967-972, closely resembles *Teseide*, ix, 28, but really comes from *Filostrato*, ii, 80. In like manner, *Troilus*, iii, 1310-1318, is closer to *Filostrato*, iii, 31, 33, than to *Teseide*, xii, 76.

The general and particular influence of the *Teseide* on the *Troilus* may be discerned in the use of a number of more or less elaborate astronomical and mythological definitions of time. Such things are hardly found in the *Filostrato*.² Examples from the *Teseide*³ are: ii, 1; iii, 5-7, 43; iv, 1; v, 103; vii, 94; ix, 29; x, 1, 88; xii, 64, 81. in the same journal, XX, 80; Curry, *The Middle English Ideal of Personal Beauty*, pp. 48-49.

¹ Note that Chaucer may well have remembered *Inferno*, xxx, 1-12, when he wrote *Troilus*, iv, 1538-1540.

² I have noted only v, 68-69 (*Troilus*, v, 647-648); i, 18 (*Troilus*, i, 155-165) is not the same kind of thing.

³ Cf. *Ninfale Fiesolano*, iv, 1.

The device took Chaucer's fancy, and he used it freely, not only in the *Troilus* but in his later poetry as well. At least two of the passages from the *Teseide* appear in the *Troilus*: ii, 1 (*Troilus*, v, 8-11), and vii, 94 (*Troilus*, v, 274-279); and iii, 5-7, may have influenced *Troilus*, ii, 50-56 (see p. 113). Other examples from the *Troilus* are: ii, 904-910; iii, 1415-1420; iv, 1590-1593 (cf. v, 1188-1190); v, 1016-1020, 1107-1110; cf. iii, 624-626 (see *C. T.*, A 3514-3521). The following passages in *The Canterbury Tales* illustrate his fondness for this kind of rhetorical adornment: — *Prologue*, 1 ff. (cf. *Teseide*, iii, 5-7; *Troilus*, ii, 50-56); *Knight's Tale*, A 1491-1496; introduction to *Man of Law's Tale*, B 1-15; *Nun's Priest's Tale*, B, 4377-4389; *Merchant's Tale*, E, 1795-1799, 1885-1887, 2219-2224; *Squire's Tale*, F, 47-51, 263-265, 385-387, 671-672; *Franklin's Tale*, F, 1016-1018, 1245-1255; *Parson's Prologue*, I, 1-12.

In some of these examples there is more than a suggestion of the humorous consciousness on Chaucer's part that he is indulging in what Scott called the "big bow-wow style."¹ This comes out in gratifying fashion in *The Franklin's Tale*:

Til that the brighte sonne loste his hewe,
For thorisonte hath reft the sonne his light,
This is as muche to seye as it was night (F 1016-1018).

The same spirit (which some critics mistake for *naïveté*) is discernible in *Troilus*, ii, 904-910:

The dayes honour and the hevenes yē,²
The nightes fo, — al this clepe I the sonne ! —
Gan westren faste, and downward for to wrye,
As he that hadde his dayes cours yronne, etc.

Boccaccio's fondness for such figures in the *Teseide* is due in large part to his admiration for the *Thebaid*, in which they are common. As a specimen we may take a passage which Boccaccio seems to have reworked in the *Teseide*, vii, 94:

Nondum cuncta polo vigil inclinaverat astra
Ortus, et instantem cornu tenuiore videbat
Luna diem, trepidas ubi iam Tithonia nubes
Discutit ac reduci magnum parat aethera Phoebus (xii, 1-4).³

¹ Compare B 1-15 with B 4383-4389.

² "Mundi oculus," Ovid, *Met.*, iv, 228.

³ Cf. p. 110, above.

Other examples from the *Thebaid* are: — i, 97-99, 336-346, 692-693; ii, 134-140, 527-528; iii, 33-39, 440-441; iv, 1-3, 680-682; v, 85-89, 296-298, 459-460, 476-477; vi, 25-27, 238-241; vii, 470-473; viii, 271-274; x, 1-2; xii, 50-51, 228-229.

No doubt both Boccaccio and Chaucer felt in this matter the influence of Dante, who is notably fond of such figures. See for example, *Inferno*, i, 37-40; *Purgatorio*, i, 19-21;¹ ii, 1-9; ix, 1-9; xv, 1-9; xix, 1-6;² xxv, 1-3; xxvii, 1-5; xxx, 1-6; *Paradiso*, xx, 1-6; xxix, 1-6; xxx, 1-9. Cf. also Petrarch Sonnets 8, 20, 28, 168 *in Vita*; Canzone *in Vita*; Sonnet 42 *in Morte*.

¹ The prayer to the Virgin in *Paradiso*, xxxiii, 1 ff., is freely used (as everybody knows) in *The Second Nun's Tale*, G 36 ff. Vv. 13-15 are not there used, but are taken as part of Troilus' address to Love in iii, 1262-1263 (see Skeat; Koepfel, *Anglia*, XIV, 230). "The well-willy planete" in this same address (iii, 1257) reminds one of *Purgatorio*, i, 19 ("Lo bel pianeta che ad amar conforta") — a passage which Chaucer certainly admired, for he uses the next line ("Faceva tutto rider l'oriente") in *The Knight's Tale*, A 1494: "That al the orient laugheth of the light" (Skeat). It is proper to compare also *The Squire's Tale*, F 272-274, with *Purgatorio*, i, 19-21:

Lo bel pianeta che ad amar conforta
Faceva tutto rider l'oriente,
Velando i Pesci ch'erano in sua scorta.

Now dauncen Venus lusty children dere,
For in the Fish hir lady sat ful hye
And loketh on hem with a frendly ye.

² This passage may have been in Chaucer's mind when he elaborated *Filostrato*, iii, 42, 1-2, into *Troilus*, iii, 1415-1420.

APPENDIX III

THE TESEIDE AND THE THEBAID

For reference I have made a running analysis of the *Teseide*, noting parallel passages in the *Thebaid*. The table is the result of my own comparison of the two, but in checking it up I have freely used the studies of Crescini¹ and Wise,² and I hereby disclaim originality. No attempt is made to estimate the intermediate influence of the *Roman de Thebes*.³

BOOK I

After five stanzas of invocation, Boccaccio tells the story of the Amazons. These warlike ladies kill their husbands and male relatives and establish a kingdom of women. Hippolyta is elected queen. Theseus sails against them and conquers their realm after a hard fight. He marries Hippolyta and other Athenians take wives from among the Amazons (sts. 6-138). When the book closes, Theseus and his men are living in idleness and luxury in the Amazonian land.

For this First Book Boccaccio got his material largely from Hypsipyle's account of the Lemnian women in *Thebaid*, v, 49-498. Statius does not call the Lemnian women Amazons, but he lets Hypsipyle make the comparison:

Amazonio Scythiam fervere tumultu
Lunatumque putes agmen descendere, ubi arma
Indulget pater et saevi movet ostia belli (v, 144-146).

Boccaccio did not need the comparison, but it certainly encouraged him. He has made an easy and obvious combination of the Lemnian story with the orthodox legend of Theseus and Hippolyta, which is sufficiently set forth in the *Thebaid*, xii, 163-164, 519-539, 578-579, 761-762. The campaign of Theseus against the Amazons in the *Teseide* is more or less imitated from Statius's account of the attack of the Argonauts on the women warriors of Lemnos.

¹ *Contributo agli Studi sul Boccaccio*, Turin, 1887, pp. 220-247. Cf. *Giornale Storico*, XXXVIII, 447-449.

² *The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, Baltimore, 1911 (see especially pp. 78-115).

³ See Crescini, as above; Savj-Lopez, *Giornale Storico*, XXXVIII, 57-78.

i, 6-7. Certain fierce women of Scythia disdain to live under the rule of men and take counsel to slay their husbands and male relatives after the example of the granddaughters of Belus (the Danaids). So, in S v, 85 ff., Polyxo exhorts the Lemnian women: "Firmate animos et pellite sexum" (105). B 7 mentions the Danaids and so does Polyxo (S 117-120).

E come fér le nipoti di Belo
Nel tempo cheto agli novelli sposi,
Così costor ciascuna (i, 7).

Potuitne ultricia Graiis
Virginibus dare tela pater, laetusque dolorum
Sanguine securos iuvenum perfundere somnos?
At nos vulgus iners? (v, 117-120).

i, 7, 29-33. The Amazons killed fathers, brothers, sons, and husbands. So the Lemnians in S v, 200-201, 206 ff., 235-238, etc.

i. 8. Ippolita is chosen queen. In S v, 320-325 the Lemnians choose Hypsipyle queen.

i, 18. Theseus sails against the Amazons. In S v, 335 ff., the Argonauts sail up to Lemnos.

i, 29-33. See i, 7, above.

i, 47-48. The Amazons have a castle near the shore and other defences, and try to hold them against the invaders. Cf. S v, 350-356.

i, 52. They throw fire and great stones down upon the ships. Cf. S v, 376-389.

i, 61-65. Theseus harangues his men. So Jason in S v, 403-409. Theseus, of course, is present among the Argonautic assailants (v, 432).

i, 66-67. Theseus and others leap overboard into the water. Cf. S v, 402: "medias ardet descendere in undas." Cf. also S, vii, 430 ff.

i, 129-138. Love and marriage between the Amazons and the invaders. The strangers are received with feasting. Cf. S v 445-451.

i, 134. The queen of the Amazons (Ippolita) marries Theseus. Cf. S v, 453-467 (Hypsipyle and Jason). In B there are new sacrifices to Venus (134): cf. S v, 449-450 ("tunc primus in aris Ignis").

The residence of the Athenians for some time in the Amazonian land, with which Boccaccio's First Book closes and his Second Book begins, is like that of the Argonauts in Lemnos (S v, 459-460).

BOOK II

ii, 1-9. Pirithous reproves Theseus for lingering uxoriously in the land of the Amazons, and Theseus sets sail for Athens.

Detumuere animi maris, et clementior Auster
Vela vocat, ratis ipsa moram portusque quietos
Odit et adversi tendit retinacula saxi.
Inde fugam Minyae, sociosque appellat Iason (v, 468-471).

In the next four stanzas (10-13) Boccaccio gives a brief summary of the results of the expedition of the Seven against Thebes compiled from several different places in the *Thebaid*: — death of Amphiarus (vii, 794-823), of Tydeus (viii, end), of Hippomedon (ix, 455-565), of Parthenopaeus (ix, 877 ff.), of Capaneus (x, 927-939), of Eteocles and Polynices (xi, 552-573); Adrastus flees to Argos (xi, 757-761); Creon becomes king of Thebes (xi, 648-655) and refuses burial to the dead Greeks (xi, 661-664).

Stanzas 14-83 of the *Teseide* are well accounted for by Book Twelve of the *Thebaid*, 149-807. They tell of the embassy of the Grecian widows, the expedition of Theseus against Creon, the death of Creon, the sack of Thebes, and the obsequies of the Greek chieftains. There are countless imitations and bits of translation, as was to be expected, but we need not take them up in detail.¹ One of them, however, is worth mentioning, for it marks a point of contact with the Amazonian story. In stanza 52, Creon, defying Theseus, informs him that he is not now fighting against women. So in S xii, 761-762:

Non cum peltiferis, ait, haec tibi pugna puellis,
Virgineas nec crede manus, etc.

With stanza 85 of the Second Book Boccaccio begins to be original, for here is the first appearance of Palemone and Arcita. From this point to the end of the book (sts. 84-99) there is little imitation of the *Thebaid*. These twenty stanzas tell how the two young Thebans were found among the dead, taken to Athens, and imprisoned for life. One fine passage in the *Thebaid*, however, has left its mark on this passus of the *Teseide*. It is xii, 22-32, on which Boccaccio had his eye in writing stanza 85. Note especially the striking sentence

Frigida digeritur strages (xii, 29).

¹ See Crescini, pp. 230-234; Wise, pp. 78 ff.

BOOK III

Book III tells how Palemone and Arcita fell in love with Emilia, and how Pirithous procured Arcita's release from prison. Here we need expect no influence from the *Thebaid*. With iii, 66, cf. S i, 11-12, and x, 900-901.

BOOK IV

Book IV describes Arcita's wanderings: he finally returns to Athens and takes service with Theseus, under the name of Penteo. This name is that of a famous Theban king — Pentheus, mentioned in *Thebaid* iv, 565; vii, 211. I note two slight cases of imitation in details of Book iv:

Dove son ora le case eminenti
Del nostro primo Cadmo? (iv, 14).

Sed nec veteris cum regia Cadmi
Fulmineum in cinerem monitis Iunonis iniquae
Consedit (iii, 183-185).

Ove di Dionisio appaion ora,
Misero a me, gli trionfi indiani? (iv, 15).

Ceu modo gemmiferum thyrsos populatus Hydaspes
Eoasque domos, nigri vexilla triumpho
Liber et ignotos populis ostenderet Indos (viii, 237-239).

BOOK V

Book V, in the first thirty-three stanzas, describes the frantic jealousy of the imprisoned Palemone, and tells how he escapes and takes refuge in a wood, where, as it happens, Arcita is sleeping. So far there is scant opportunity for imitation. In v, 13, however, Boccaccio mentions Tisiphone, summoned by Oedipus, etc. (S i, 46-130). With stanza 34 we again connect with the *Thebaid*.

v, 34-85. Palemone discovers the sleeping Arcita. They fall to fighting, and are separated by Theseus. Here there are manifest resemblances to the struggle of Tydeus and Polynices in the courtyard of Adrastus's palace and their separation by Adrastus in the first

book of the *Thebaid* (376-481).¹ Note that Tydeus discovers Polynices asleep, and that Adrastus (like Theseus in Boccaccio) does not know who the combatants are. Again, they are both exiles. Theseus (st. 83) like Adrastus (438-446) demands the names of the rivals and the cause of their quarrel. Note, too, the kindness of both Theseus (st. 85) and Adrastus (435-481) in word and deed.

v, 86-105. The combatants disclose their identity and the ground of their quarrel. Theseus pardons them, suggests a tournament to settle the question, and gives the rivals hospitality in his palace. Here there is still a certain likeness to the Adrastus episode in *Thebaid* i. In both cases the ruler grants hospitality to the two (B v, 104-105; S i, 481 ff.). Note also that Theseus promises to give Emilia to either Palemone or Arcita, and that Adrastus marries Tydeus and Polynices to his daughters (*Thebaid*, ii, 134-261). There is also a trace of Polynices' shame with reference to his ancestry (i, 673-681) in Palemone's reluctance to wed Emilia because

Io son di tante infamie solo erede
De' primi miei rimaso (xii, 24).

In the fight in the wood Boccaccio also has his eye on the combat between Eteocles and Polynices in *Thebaid*, xi, 387 ff. He mentions them in v, 59:

Qua' fossero poi fra loro i due fratelli
D' Edippo nati non cal raccontare;
Il fuoco fe' testimonianza d'elli,
Nel qual fur messi dopo il lor mal fare.

This refers to the famous incident of the divided flame in *Thebaid*, xii, 420-446. With *Teseide*, v, 65-67, cf. *Thebaid*, xi, 513-520. That Arcita thinks Palemone dead (v, 68-69) reminds one of *Thebaid*, xi, 552-560, though the spirit of the incident is by no means similar.

BOOK VI

The Sixth Book of the *Teseide* recounts the muster of knights for the great tournament. It is mostly occupied with a list of the "barons" and their description. This book is more or less indebted to the *Thebaid*. A large number of proper names come from that poem.² The

¹ Cf. Savj-Lopez, *Giornale Storico*, XXXVI, 63-66.

² Cf. Crescini, p. 243, note 1.

account of the funeral games for Archemorus (vi) — used later by Boccaccio extensively in Book xi — is drawn on, and so is the account of the muster of the Seven. Some details are worth noting.

According to Boccaccio, King Licurgo came to the muster in black: he was

ancora lagrimoso
Per la morte di Ofelte (vi, 14) —

that is, of Opheltes or Archemorus, whose death and burial are described in *Thebaid* v-vi.

“Argeo ed Epidaurio” (vi, 19), if the text is right, looks like an error based on *Thebaid* vi, 912-913:

“Iamque aderant instructi armis Epidaurius Agreus
Et nondum fatis Dircaeus agentibus exul [sc. Polynices].

Agamemnon comes to Athens in a chariot drawn by four great bulls:

Sopra d'un carro da quattro gran tori
Tirato dall' Inachia Agamennone
Vi venne (vi, 21).

He had a black beard and wore a bearskin with gleaming claws over his armor:

Non armi chiare, non mantel lodato,
Non pettinati crin, non ornamenti
D'oro o di pietre aveva, ma legato
D'orso un velluto cuoio con lucenti
Unghioni al collo, il quale d'ogni lato
Ricoprien l'armi tutte rugginenti (vi, 22).

Compare the tigerskin which Hippomedon received as a prize in the funeral games:

Tunc genitus Talao [sc. Adrastus] victori tigrin inanem
Ire iubet, fulvo quae circumfusa nitebat
Margine et extremos auro mansueverat unguēs (vi, 721-724).

This same passage (cf. S, ix, 685-686) is also imitated in Boccaccio's description of Evandro:¹

Ed era armato d'armi forti e fiere,
E un cuoio, per mantel, d'orso piloso
Libistrico, le cui unghie già nere
Sott' oro eran nascose luminoso (vi, 36).

¹ Evander is not mentioned in the *Thebaid*.

Cromi or Cromis from Etolia is described in *Teseide*, vi, 27-29. He rides on a man-eating horse:

Sopra Strimon caval di Diomede,
D'uomini mangiator, come si crede (27).

This is Chromis, son of Hercules (*Thebaid*, vi, 346-350), whose horses in the chariot race at the funeral games were "Getici pecus Diomedis" (348). One of them was named Strymon (464). Boccaccio introduces the creature again in a strange incident in the tournament (viii, 120), to which we shall return presently.

Ippodamo (st. 29) comes next to Cromi in Boccaccio's list, obviously because they are brought together by Statius in the chariot-race: "It Chromis Hippodamusque" etc. (S, vi, 346-354, 436-490). Boccaccio says he was the son of "Eomonia pulita," which is a misreading of S, vi, 347: "ab Oenomao."

Nestore from Pilos, son of Neleo, appears in st. 30. He is still a young man. This is from the muster in *Thebaid*, iv:

Avia Dyme
Mittit opem densasque Pylos Neleia turmas;
Nondum nota Pylos iuvenisque aetate secunda
Nestor, et ire tamen peritura in castra negavit (iv, 124-127).

In stanza 52 comes "Ida Piseo," crowned for his victory in the Olympic Games.

Prior omnibus Idas,
Nuper Olympiacis umbratus tempora ramis,
Prosilit, excipiunt plausu Pisaea iuventus
Eleaeque manus (vi, 553-556).

He is a contestant in the footrace at the games for Archemorus, and accordingly Boccaccio represents him and his company as fast runners (st. 53). The comparison in this stanza comes from what is said of Parthenopaeus in *Thebaid* vi, 568.

Stanza 61 shows a close translation of *Thebaid*, vii, 340-342.

BOOK VII

vii, 1-21. The kings and barons assemble in the theatre (1-2) — for the theatre cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 249-264 — and Theseus explains the purpose and the rules of the tournament in a speech which the people

applaud (3-14). The two companies are formed, Arcita's and Palemone's (15-21).

In sts. 22-93 we have the prayers of Arcita, Palemone, and Emilia, with a description of the temples. Here Boccaccio is again much indebted to Statius.¹

vii, 23-28. Arcita prays to Mars. With the vow of hair and beard (28) cf. *Thebaid*, ii, 255; vi, 198-201, 607-610; viii, 487-488, 492-493.

vii, 29. Mars was in his great and horrible "ospizio" [in Thrace], and the prayer wings its way thither. The personified prayer feels terror at the sights it sees. Cf. *Thebaid*, vii, 1-13, when Jupiter sends Mercury to Thrace with a message to Mars, and vii, 74-75 (terror of Mercury).

vii, 30-38. Description of the region and of the temple of Mars. Closely translated from *Thebaid*, vii, 34-63, cf. 68.

vii, 39-41. Omens observed by Arcita. Partly from *Thebaid*, vii, 64-69 (cf. ii, 260-261).

vii, 42-49. Palemone prays to Venus.

vii, 50. The prayer flies up to the temple on Mount Cithaeron (Citerone). Here Boccaccio is misled by the resemblance between the names *Cythera* and *Cithaeron*.

Sopra il monte Citerone,
 dove si posa
 Di Citerea il tempio e la magione
 Infra altissimi prini alquanto ombrosa (st. 50).

Mount Cithaeron, between Boeotia and Attica, is often mentioned in the *Thebaid*. Note especially —

Inde plagam qua molle sedens in plana Cithaeron
 Porrigitur lassumque inclinat ad aequora montem
 Praeterit (i, 330-332)

Amica Cithaeron
 Silva rogis (xii, 52-53).

vii, 51-66. Description of the garden and temple of Venus, also of the goddess herself. On the resemblance to the Court of Love tradition, see Neilson, who remarks the parallel to Claudian.² Though

¹ For ceremonies, prayers, and omens, cf. *Thebaid*, ii, 244-261, 704 ff.; viii, 298 ff.

² *The Origins and Sources of the Court of Love*, pp. 116-117, 15-17 ([Harvard] *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, VI).

sts. 51-66 are not from the *Thebaid*, yet the suggestion came from the passage about the temple and region of Mars (above-mentioned, st. 30). Then Boccaccio carried out the suggestion by the use of the Court of Love tradition and of miscellaneous classical material.

vii, 67. Venus hears Palemone's prayer. Strife ensues in heaven between her and Mars, but they find a means to reconcile his petition with Arcita's. Cf. *Thebaid*, iii, 260-316; x, 893-894.

vii, 68-69. Palemone remains at his devotions, etc.

vii, 70-76. Emilia makes an offering to Diana. Description of the temple and the rites. With st. 72 cf. *Thebaid*, ix, 573-574; with st. 75 cf. *Thebaid*, iv, 452-454; with st. 76 cf. *Thebaid*, iv, 461-468.

vii, 77-87. Emilia's prayer. See the prayer to Diana in *Thebaid*, ix, 608 ff. (cf. vi, 633-637).

vii, 88-93. The omen to Emilia. With st. 92 cf. S, ix, 595-596.

vii, 94-145. The combatants assemble in the theatre, and all is ready for the tournament. For st. 94 cf. *Thebaid*, xii, 1-4; for the theatre (108-110) cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 249-264; for the gathering of the people to see the show (112) cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 249-250, etc.

The simile of the lion in st. 106 is from the *Thebaid*, iv, 494-499, and that of the wild boar in st. 119 is expanded from *Thebaid*, xi, 530-531:

Qual per lo bosco il cinghiar rovinoso,
Poi ch' ha di dietro a sè sentiti i cani,
Le setole levate, etc, (119).

Fulmineos veluti praeceps cum cominus egit
Ira sues strictisque erexit tergora saetis (xi, 530-531).

BOOK VIII

The tournament is described — Arcita is victor. There are 131 stanzas. Much of this is mere imitation of the tournaments in the Old French chivalric romances. There is a plethora of proper names, many of them invented *ad hoc*. One very curious incident was suggested by Statius. Cromis rides a man-eating horse. In the tournament

Di Cromis il roncione,
Ch' ancora che solea si ricordava
Gli uomin mangiar, pel braccio Palemone
Co' denti prese forte, et sì l'aggrava

Col duol, che 'l fece alla terra cadere,
Mal grado ch' e' n'avesse, e rimanere.

E quale il drago talora i pulcini
Dell' aquila ne porta renitenti,
O fa la leonessa i leoncini
Per tema degli aguati delle genti;
Così faceva quel vibrando i crini,
Forte strignendo Palemon co' denti;
Cui egli aveva preso in tal maniera
Che maraviglia aveva chiunque v' era.

E se non fosse ched egli fu atato
Da' suoi avversi, il caval l' uccidea;
A cui di bocca appena fu tirato,
E tratto fuor della crudel mislea,
E senza alcuno indugio disarmato
Per Arcita, che l'arme sue volea,
Per offerirle a Marte, se avvenesse
Ch' a lui il dì il campo rimanesse (120-122).

And so Palemone lost the tournament and Arcita was declared the victor. In the *Thebaid*, Hippodamus, the chief antagonist of Chromis in the chariot race is thrown:

Sed Thraces equi ut videre iacentem
Hippodamum, redit illa fames, iamiamque trementem
Partiti furiis, ni frena ipsosque frementes
Oblitus palmae, retro Tirynthus heros
Torsisset victusque et conlaudatus abisset (vi, 486-490).

As to Chromis's man-eating horse Strymon, see *Teseide*, vi, 27, and *Thebaid*, vi 348, 464 (cf. xii, 155-157).

BOOK IX

In stanzas 1-9 Boccaccio still imitates Statius. A Fury scares the horse of the victorious Arcita, who is thrown and desperately hurt. So in the *Thebaid*, in the funeral games, a monster frightens Arion, Adrastus' steed, which is driven by Polynices. Polynices is thrown from the chariot and comes near being killed (vi, 491-512). The monster is sent by Phoebus, as the Fury in Boccaccio is sent by Venus. With *Teseide*, ix, 7-8:

Il qual [sc. Arcita's horse] per ispavento in piè levossi,
Ed indietro cader tutto lasciossi.

Sotto il qual cadde il già contento Arcita,
E il forte arcione gli premette il petto,
E sì il ruppe, che una ferita
Tutto pareva il corpo al giovinetto —

compare *Thebaid*, viii, 540-542:

Ruit ille [sc. equus] ruentem
In Prothoum lapsasque manu quaerentis habenas
In voltus galeam clipeumque in pectora calcat.

For the description of the Fury in st. 5, cf. *Thebaid*, i, 90-91, 103-113; with st. 6 cf. *Thebaid*, i, 97-98.

ix, 9-28. Arcita is picked up amid lamentation and receives medical treatment. He recovers his senses, and the victory and Emilia are declared his.

ix, 29-50. Though suffering dreadfully, Arcita rides in a triumphal car. A triumph like a Roman triumph is celebrated.

ix, 51-80. Theseus addresses the warriors and praises their valor on both sides. All the prisoners taken are released except Palemone, who is declared Emilia's prisoner. She sets him free and gives him a ring and a horse and arms.

ix, 81-83. Arcita claims Emilia, and their marriage takes place. For sacrifices at the wedding (83) cf. *Thebaid*, ii, 244-261.

BOOK X

The first 92 stanzas are mostly original. Those killed in the tournament are burned and their ashes inurned; the wounded receive treatment (1-10). Arcita proves to be mortally wounded; Ischion comes from Epidaurus to treat him, but pronounces the case hopeless (11-14). He grows worse and worse, and bequeaths all he possesses (including Emilia) to Palemone (15-36). His address to Palemone and Palemone's to him; Ippolita and Emilia try to comfort him (37-52). Arcita talks with Emilia, recommending Arcita to her favor; her grief; his lament; general sorrow (53-87). Nine days after the tournament, Arcita begs his friends to prepare sacrifices to Mercury, so that the god may conduct his soul to a pleasant place. Palemone offers

the sacrifices next day (88-92). Arcita's prayer, asserting the innocence of his life; his lament for his youth: he shall love Emilia forever; his death (93-112).

In Arcita's prayer, with the protestations of the innocence of his life (93 ff.), there is mention of the sins of his race which is reminiscent of passages in the *Thebaid* and illustrates Boccaccio's intimate knowledge of that epic. Sts. 95-96 deal with Cadmus, Agave, Semele, and Athamas: cf. *Thebaid*, iii, 179-194, and iv, 553-571, in both of which places all four are mentioned. With the reference to Oedipus in st. 96 cf. particularly the protestations of innocence by the mother of Menoeceus in *Thebaid*, x, 796-797; cf. also i, 233-235:

Nè amante

Della mia madre fui, la nazione
Nel sen materno indietro ritornante
Siccome Edippo (x, 96).

Non ego monstrifero coitu revoluta notavi
Pignora, nec nato peperì funesta nepotes (x, 796-797).

Scandere quin etiam thalamos hic impius heres
Patris et immeritae gremium incestare parentis
Appetiit, proprios monstro revolutus in ortus (i, 233-235).

For other lists of Theban crimes and tragedies see *Thebaid*, i, 1-16, 227-241; xi, 486-492 (cf. i, 673 ff.).

Stanzas 110 and 112, as well as the fifth and sixth stanzas of book xi, show the influence of the finest passage in the *Thebaid* — one of the most beautiful, indeed, in the whole range of epic poetry — that in which the dying Atys calls for Ismene his betrothed (viii, 637-655). Cf. particularly *Teseide* x, 110, with 648-650; x, 112, with 643-645; xi, 5-6, with 653-655.

BOOK XI

This book shows throughout an imitation, often very close, of the funeral of Archemorus (Opheltes) in the Sixth Book of the *Thebaid*.

xi, 1-12. General grief for Arcita, especial sorrow of Emilia and Palemone. With sts. 5-6 we have already compared *Thebaid*, viii, 653-655. Sts. 11-12 are influenced by vi, 45-53.

xi, 13-29. Preparation of Arcita's pyre. Note the following parallels: B 14, S, vi, 84-86; B 15, S 54-56, 61-62; B 16, S 25-30, 124-

125; B 18-25, S 84-113 (the pyre of Opheltes is mentioned in B 18); B 26-29, S 54-66, 84-86.

xi, 30-58 (cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 28-237). Arcita's funeral. His ashes are put into an urn. Cf. B 30 with S 28-32; B 31 with S 33-36; B 32 with S 37-43; B 33-34 with S 45-53; B 35-36 with S 67-81, 193-194; B 37 with S 126-128, 210-212; B 38 with S 128-130, 197-198; B 39-40 with S 130-133; B 41 with S 135-141; B 42 with S 197-201; B 43 with S 122-124; B 44 with S 202, 184-185; B 46 with S 184-185; B 47-50 with S 194-203, 206-210; B 51 with S 211-212, 204-205, 130-133; B 52-56 with S 213-226; B 57 with S 234-237.

xi, 59-68. The funeral games (S, 249-946). Cf. B 59 with S vi, 295-296; B 60-61 with S 531-549; B 62 with S 833, 834, 847; B 64 with S 729-734; B 66 with S 646-647.

xi, 69-89. A temple is built by Palemone where the pyre stood. Description of the temple. The history of Arcita's life is represented therein. The suggestion for these stanzas is in *Thebaid*, vi, 242-248 (cf. 268-294).

xi, 90-91. Arcita's urn is placed on a column in the temple, with an inscription.

Book XII

xii, 1-19. Continued grief of Palemone and Emilia. Theseus and the Greeks think it is time for the mourning to cease. Theseus wishes Palemone to marry Emilia. With B st. 6, cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 46-48. For Foroneo (st. 18) see *Thebaid*, ii, 219.

xii, 20-46. Palemone and Emilia have scruples about marriage, but Theseus overrules their objections.

xii, 47-80. Preparations for the wedding. Arcita is forgotten. Description of Emilia (53-64). The marriage ceremony and festivities. With st. 68 cf. *Thebaid*, ii, 244-261.

xii, 81-86. Two months have elapsed since the "high barons" came to Athens for the joust. They return to their several countries. Palemone lives in joy with his wife. Conclusion — The author's address to his book. With B, sts. 84-86, cf. S, xii, 810-819.

The poem closes with a sonnet addressed by the author to the Muses "per lo libro suo" (he beseeches them to give it to his lady) and with the reply of the Muses ("Your lady has named the book *Teseide*"). Cf. S, xii, 810-819.